AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. V.—(XV.)—NOVEMBER, 1896.—NO. 5.

LEO XIII AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

WHEN, some years ago,[1] the Sovereign Pontiff sent forth his solemn call unto the nations of Christendom to reunite their forces in defense of the religion of Christ, many earnest minds outside of the Catholic Church understood and welcomed the invitation. Active steps were taken to facilitate union among the Eastern schismatics, and negotiations bearing upon the question of distinct rites with a uniform profession of the essentials of faith are still in progress.

England, although since the so-called Reformation it had renounced obedience to the See of Rome, nevertheless amid varying dissensions maintained the substance of Christian teaching as expressed through ancient tradition and the S. Scriptures, whilst it also recognized the hierarchical form of church-government, practically, as an Apostolic institution. England's National Church differs in this from the Protestant communions generally, that she requires Episcopal ordination for her clerical members, and that she retains in some measure the tone and liturgical structure of the ancient Catholic faith. Her doctrinal standards, as interpreted by her leading members to-day, declare that her Bishops, whilst they lack papal confirmation, are duly called, elected, consecrated and commissioned, at least in the sense in which the first four Gene-

1 Encycl. Praeclara gratul. 20 Jun. 1894.

ral Councils of the Church required such titles for the exercise of the episcopal function; and she acknowledges the necessity of a transmission of the priestly and episcopal titles through an unbroken chain of the hierarchical succession. Catholics believed on historical grounds that this succession had been broken by the creation of bishops at the will of English sovereigns and ministers who claimed the right to dispense with those divinely instituted forms by which the grace of the priesthood is communicated. That this belief was not arbitrary and born of prejudice is proved by the large number of conversions to the Catholic Church from the ranks of educated and high-minded Anglicans. Many of these set out with evident sincerity of purpose to examine the question from its historical point of view, in order that they might obtain certainty as to their position since they felt it necessary to be of the Catholic Church. But not only the large number of eminent and learned converts giving their verdict against the continuity of Apostolic succession, and that for the most part at great sacrifices, have testified to the existence of a grave doubt regarding the validity of Anglican ordinations; we have as standing witnesses those leaders of the High Church party who have openly confessed by their serious anxiety in seeking recognition from various schismatical bodies that they feel by no means assured of the strength of their claim. "They have," as a writer in the London *Times* states it, "been referring to every possible authority in the hope of obtaining somewhere an opinion favorable to their case. They have appealed to the Greek Church, but the Greek Church will have nothing to say to them. They have tried the Jansenist authorities in Holland, but the Jansenists, after a long and careful inquiry, found that they could give them no comfort. As a last hope they turned to the Holy See, and they have now got their answer from it."

It was a risky move, therefore, when certain representatives of the Anglican Church pointed out that their heeding the call of Leo XIII to Christian union was to be dependent on his recognition of the validity of their ordinations

by right of unbroken Apostolic succession. Leo's words could not alter the facts of history, but if the facts were doubtful the weight of his authority might turn the balance of evidence in their favor. It was worldly wisdom on the part of the Anglican spokesmen, but the result has only confirmed the belief that Leo XIII was not to be swayed by such a policy, though it deprived him of a seeming triumph.

Now the question is settled. So far as Catholics are concerned the decision has not altered their attitude toward Anglicans a single degree. As for Anglicans, those at least who would sincerely accept the traditions of the early Church, they are committed to a dilemma out of which there is no *via media*. The Papal document is very clear. Even Protestants admit that, so far as it pronounces upon the validity of Anglican orders, it is thoroughly convincing in its line of argument. They object to the Pope's definition of the rite by which the priestly and episcopal offices are properly conferred, to his view of the spiritual prerogatives which a successor of the Apostolic dignity receives, and of the disposition which valid ordination to the sacred ministry essentially requires. But the objection has no force from the Anglican point of view, because the Anglican Church does practically accept the essential necessity of priestly and episcopal ordination as held in the Catholic Church. To a Protestant or Nonconformist it may be a matter of indifference how he obtains his right of ministry, provided he finds a congregation to accept his services, or a synod which passes on his ability and recommends him to a church; such is not, however, the understood position of that party which calls upon Leo and Catholics to recognize the character of its ministry. Hence the arguments of the Pontiff, in which he apparently waives the question of Parker's ordination, and insists upon the historically established fact that the Edwardian ritual was used during several generations, and being insufficient to communicate the divine gift of episcopal consecration broke the continuity, are not only convincing but conclusive. They leave no alternative to those who would be members of the Catholic priesthood, but to be reordained under the

jurisdiction of the lawful successor of St. Peter, or else to abandon the claim that they have any other basis of belief in the Christian priesthood than that of the Protestant sects. Turn the matter as you will, there is only one way for Anglicans to the orthodox Catholic Apostolic Church, and that is the way of submission to the spiritual supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, the arguings of Lord Halifax notwithstanding.

The Pontifical Letter will speak for itself. We append both the authentic Latin text and its English translation.

APOSTOLIC LETTER ON ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS.

Leo Episcopvs

SERVVS SERVORVM DEI

Ad Perpetvam Rei Memoriam.

Apostolicae curae et caritatis, qua *Pastorem magnum ovium Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum* (1), referre pro munere et imitari, aspirante eius gratia, studemus non exiguam partem pernobili Anglorum nationi tribuimus. Voluntatis in ipsam Nostrae ea praecipue testis est epistola quam superiore anno dedimus propriam *ad Anglos, regnum Christi in fidei unitate quaerentes:* eiusdem quippe gentis et veterem

1 Hebr. xiii, 20.

Leo, Bishop,

SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD.

In Perpetual Remembrance.

We have given to the interests of the noble English nation no slight part of the Apostolic care and charity with which, aided by His grace, We endeavor to fulfill the office and follow in the footsteps of the great Pastor of the flock, Our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the Letter which last year We sent to the English seeking the Kingdom of Christ in unity of faith, We recalled the memory of the ancient union of that people with the Mother Church, and We strove to hasten the day of a happy reconcilation by

cum Ecclesia matre coniunctionem commemorando revocavimus, et felicem reconciliationem, excitatâ in animis orandi Dei sollertia, contendimus maturare. Rursusque haud ita pridem, quum communibus universe litteris de unitate Ecclesiae fusius agere visum est, non ultimo loco respeximus Angliam; spe praelucente, posse documenta Nostra tum catholicis firmitatem tum dissidentibus salutare lumen afferre. Atque illud fateri libet quod aeque gentis humanitatem ac multorum sollicitudinem salutis aeternae commendat, id est quam benevole Anglis probata sit instantia Nostra et dicendi libertas, nullo quidem acta humanae rationis impulsu.—Nunc autem eâdem Nos mente eodemque animo deliberatum habemus studia convertere ad quamdam non minoris momenti causam, quae cum ea ipsa re votisque Nostris cohaeret. Quod enim apud Anglos, aliquanto postquam ab unitatis christianae centro abscessum est, novus stirring up men's hearts to offer anxious prayer to God. And again, more recently, when it seemed good to Us to treat more fully the unity of the Church in a universal appeal, England had not the last place in Our mind in the hope that our teaching might both strengthen Catholics and bring the saving light to those separated from us. It is pleasing to acknowledge the generous way in which Our endeavor and openness of speech, inspired by no mere human motives, have met the approval of the English people, a fact which testifies not less to their nobility of mind than to the solicitude of many for their eternal salvation.

With the same mind and intention We now purpose to turn Our thoughts to a matter of no less importance and closely connected with the same subject and with Our hopes. For an opinion already prevalent, confirmed more than once by the action and constant practice of the C h u r c h, maintained that when in England, shortly after it was rent from the centre of Christian unity, a a new rite for conferring Holy

plane ritus ordinibus sacris conferendis, sub rege Eduardo VI, fuit publice inductus; defecisse idcirco verum Ordinis sacramentum, quale Christus instituit, simulque hierarchicam successionem, iam tenuit communis sententia, quam non semel Ecclesiae acta et constans disciplina firmarunt. Attamen recentiore memoria hisque maxime annis invaluit controversia, sacraene Ordinationes ritu eduardiano peractae, natura sacramenti effectuque polleant; faventibus, affirmate vel dubitanter, non modo scriptoribus anglicanis nonnullis, sed paucis etiam catholicis praesertim non Anglis. Alteros quippe movebat praestantia sacerdotii christiani, exoptantes ut duplici eius in corpus Christi potestate ne carerent sui; movebat alteros consilium expediendi quodammodo illis reditus ad unitatem: utrisque vero hoc persuasum esse videbatur, iam studiis in eo genere cum aetate provectis, novisque litterarum monumentis ex oblivione erutis, retractari auctoritate Nostra causam non inopportunum fore. Nos autem ea consilia atque optata minime negligentes

Orders was publicly introduced under Edward VI, the true Sacrament of Orders as instituted by Christ lapsed, and with it the hierarchical succession. For some time, however, and in these last years especially, a controversy has sprung up as to whether the Sacred Orders conferred according to the Edwardine Ordinal possessed the nature and effect of a sacrament. In favor of the absolute validity were not only certain Anglican writers, but some few Catholics, chiefly non-English. The consideration of the excellency of the Christian priesthood moved Anglican writers in this matter, desirous as they were that their own people should not lack the two-fold power over the Body of Christ. Catholic writers were impelled by a wish to clear the way for the return of Anglicans to holy unity. Both, indeed, thought that in view of studies fostered by the light of recent research, and of new documents rescued from oblivion, it was not inopportune to reexamine the question under the sanction of Our authority. And, We, not disregarding such desires and opinions,

maximeque voci obsequentes apostolicae caritatis, censuimus nihil non experiri quod videretur quoquo modo conducere ad animarum vel avertenda damna vel utilitates fovendas.

Placuit igitur de retractanda causa benignissime indulgere: ita sane, ut per summam novae disquisitionis sollertiam, omnis in posterum vel species quidem dubitandi esset remota. Quapropter certo numero viris doctrina et eruditione praestantibus, quorum compertae erant dissimiles in ipsa causa opiniones, negotium dedimus ut momenta sententiae suae scriptis mandarent: eos deinde ad Nos accitos iussimus communicare inter se scripta, et quidquid eo amplius ad rem cognitu esset dignum, indagare atque expendere. Consultumque a Nobis est, ut ipsi diplomata opportuna omni possent copia in tabulariis vaticanis sive nota recognoscere sive inexplorata educere; itemque ut prompta haberent quaecumque eiusdem generis acta apud sacrum Consilium, quod *Suprema* vocatur, asservarentur, neque minus quaecumque ad hoc tempus doctiores viri in utramque

and, above all, obeying the dictates of Apostolic charity, thought that nothing should be left untried that might in any way tend to preserve souls from harm or procure their advantage.

It has, therefore, pleased Us to allow the cause to be re-examined, so that by reason of a most thorough examination, all doubt, even its least shadow, should be removed for the future. To this end We commissioned a certain number of men noted for their learning and ability, whose opinions in this matter were known to be divergent, to state the grounds of their judgments in writing. We then, having summoned them to Our presence, directed them to communicate the results of their inquiry to each other, and further to investigate and discuss whatever appeared requisite to obtain a full knowledge of the matter. We were careful also that they should be able to re-examine all documents bearing on this question which were known to exist in the Vatican archives; to search for new ones, and even to have at their disposal all acts relating to this subject

partem evulgassent. Huiusmodi adiumentis instructos, voluimus eos in singulares congressiones convenire; quae ad duodecim sunt habitae, praeside uno ex S. R. E. Cardinalibus a Nobismetipsis designato, data singulis facultate disputandi libera. Denique earumdem congressionum acta, una cum ceteris documentis, Venerabilibus Fratribus Nostris Cardinalibus ex eodem Consilio iussimus exhiberi omnia; qui meditata causa eaque coram Nobis deinde agitata, suam quisque sententiam dicerent.

Hoc ducendae rei ordine praestituto, ad intimam tamen aestimationem causae aequum erat non ante aggredi, quam id perstudiose quaesitum apparuisset, quo loco ea iam esset secundum Apostolicae Sedis praescriptiones institutamque consuetudinem; cuius consuetudinis et initia et vim magni profecto interesset reputare. Quocirca in primis perpensa sunt documenta praecipua quibus Decessores Nostri, rogatu reginae Mariae, singulares curas ad reconciliationem ecclesiae Anglicae contulerunt. Nam Iulius III Cardinalem Reginaldum Pole,

which are adduced by learned men on both sides. We ordered them, when prepared in this way, to meet together in special sessions. These, to the number of twelve, were held under the presidency of one of the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, appointed by Ourselves, and all were invited to the freest discussion. Finally, We directed that the acts of these meetings, together with all other documents, should be submitted to Our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the same Council, so that when all had studied the whole subject and discussed it in Our presence, each might give his opinion.

This order for discussing the matter having been determined upon, it was necessary, with a view to forming a true estimate of the real state of the question, to enter upon it only after careful inquiry as to how the matter stood in relation to the prescription and settled custom of the Holy See, the origin and force of which custom it was undoubtedly of great importance to determine. For this reason, in the first place, the principal documents in which our predecessors, at the re-

natione Anglum, multiplici laude eximium, Legatum de latere ad id opus destinavit, *tamquam pacis et dilectionis angelum suum*, eique mandata seu facultates extra ordinem normasque agendi tradidit[1]; quas deinde Paulus IV confirmavit et declaravit. In quo ut recte colligatur quidnam in se commemorata documenta habeant ponderis, sic oportet fundamenti instar statuere, eorum propositum nequaquam a re abstractum fuisse, sed rei omnino inhaerens ac peculiare. Quum enim facultates Legato apostolico ab iis Pontificibus tributae, Angliam dumtaxat religionisque in ea statum respicerent; normae item agendi ab eisdem eidem Legato quaerenti impertitae, minime quidem esse poterant ad illa generatim decernenda sine quibus sacrae ordinationes non valeant, sed debebant attinere proprie ad

quest of Queen Mary, exercised their special care for the reconciliation of the English Church were considered. Thus Julius III sent Cardinal Reginald Pole, an Englishman and illustrious in many ways, to be his Legate *de latere* for the purpose, *as his angel of peace and love*, and gave him special mandates or faculties and directions for his guidance. These Paul VI confirmed and explained. And here, to interpret rightly the force of these documents, it is necessary to lay it down as a fundamental principle that they were certainly not intended to deal with an abstract state of things, but with a specific and concrete issue. For, since the faculties given by these Pontiffs to the Apostolic Legate had reference to England only, and to the state of religion therein, and since the rules of action were laid down by them at the request of the said Legate, they could not have been mere directions for determining the necessary conditions for the validity of ordinations in general. They must pertain directly to providing for Holy Orders in the said kingdom

1 Id factum augusto mense MDLIII per litteras sub plumbo, *Si ullo unquam tempore* et *Post nuntium Nobis*, atque alias.

providendum de ordinibus sacris in eo regno, prout temporum monebant rerumque conditiones expositae. Hoc ipsum, praeter quam quod ex natura et modo eorumdem documentorum perspicuum est, inde pariter liquet, quod alienum prorsus fuisset, ita velle de iis quae sacramento Ordinis conficiendo necesse sunt, propemodum commonefieri Legatum, eumque virum cuius doctrina etiam in Concilio Tridentino eluxerat.

Ista probe tenentibus non difficulter patebit quare in litteris Iulii III ad Legatum apostolicum, perscriptis die VIII martii MDLIV, distincta sit mentio de iis primum qui *rite et legitime promoti*, in suis ordinibus essent retinendi, tum de iis qui *non promoti ad sacros ordines*, possent, *si digni et idonei reperti fuissent, promoveri.* Nam certe definiteque notatur, ut reapse erat, duplex hominum classis; hinc eorum qui sacram ordinationem vere suscepissent, quippe id vel ante Henrici secessionem, vel si post eam et per ministros errore dissidiove implicitos, ritu tamen catholico consueto; inde aliorum qui inas the recognized condition of the circumstances and times demanded. This, besides being clear from the nature and form of the said documents, is also obvious from the fact that it would have been altogether irrelevant to thus instruct the Legate, one whose learning had been conspicuous in the Council of Trent, as to the conditions necessary for the bestowal of the Sacrament of Orders.

For those who justly estimate these facts it will not be difficult to understand why, in the letters of Julius III, issued to the Apostolic Legate on March 8, 1554, there is a distinct mention of, first, those who were *rightly and lawfully promoted* to orders, and then, of others who, *not promoted to sacred orders*, might *be promoted if they were found to be worthy and fitting subjects.* For it is clearly and definitely noted, as indeed was the case, that there were two classes of men —the first, those who had really received sacred orders, either before the secession of Henry VIII, or, if after it, and by ministers infected by error and schism, still accord-

itiati essent secundum Ordinale eduardianum, qui propterea possent *promoveri*, quia ordinationem accepissent irritam. Neque aliud sane Pontificis consilium fuisse, praeclare confirmat epistola eiusdem Legati, die XXIX ianuarii MDLV, facultates suas episcopo Norwicensi demandantis. Id amplius est potissime considerandum quod eae ipsae Iulii III litterae afferunt, de facultatibus pontificiis libere utendis, etiam in eorum bonum quibus munus consecrationis, *minus rite et non servata forma Ecclesiae consueta*, impensum fuit: qua quidem locutione ii certe designabantur qui consecrati eduardiano ritu; praeter eam namque et catholicam formam alia nulla erat eo tempore in Anglia.

Haec autem apertiora fient commemmorando legationem quam Phillipus et Maria reges, suadente Cardinali Polo, Romam ad Pontificem februario mense MDLV miserunt. Regii oratores, viri tres *admo-*

ing to the accustomed Catholic rite; the second, those who were initiated according to the Edwardine Ordinal, who, therefore, were to be *promoted* since they had received an ordination which was null. And that the mind of the Pope was this and nothing else is clearly confirmed by the letter of the said Legate (January 29, 1555), sub-delegating his faculties to the Bishop of Norwich. Moreover, what the letters of Julius III themselves say about freely using the Pontifical faculties even in behalf of those who had received their consecration *not according to the rite and the accustomed form of the Church*, is to be especially noted. By this expression those only could be meant who had been consecrated according to the Edwardine rite, since besides it and the Catholic form there was then no other in England.

This becomes even still clearer when we consider the legation which, on the advice of Cardinal Pole, the Soverign Princes Philip and Mary sent to the Pope in Rome in the month of February, 1555. The Royal Am-

dum insignes et omni virtute praediti, in quibus Thomas Thirlby episcopus Eliensis, sic habebant propositum, Pontificem de conditione rei religiosae in eo regno notitia ampliore edocere, ab ipsoque in primis petere ut ea quae Legatus ad eiusdem regni cum Ecclesia reconciliationem curaverat atque effecerat, haberet rata et confirmaret: eius rei causâ omnia ad Pontificem allata sunt testimonia scripta quae oportebat, partesque Ordinalis novi proxime ad rem facientes. Iamvero Paulus IV legatione magnifice admissa, eisdemque testimoniis per certos aliquot Cardinales *diligenter discussis*, et *habita deliberatione matura*, literas *Praeclara Carissimi* sub plumbo dedit die XX iunii eodem anno. In his quum comprobatio plena et robur additum sit rebus a Polo gestis, de ordinationibus sic est praescriptum:... *qui ad ordines ecclesiasticos... ab alio quam ab episcopo rite recte ordinato promoti fuerunt, eosdem ordines... de novo suscipere teneantur.* Quinam autem essent episcopi tales, *non rite recteque ordinati*, satis iam indicaverant superiora documenta, facultatesque in eam rem a Legato

bassadors, three men "most illustrious and endowed with every virtue," of whom one was Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, were charged to inform the Pope more fully as to the religious condition of the country, and especially to beg that he would ratify and confirm what the Legate had been at pains to effect, and had succeeded in effecting, towards the reconciliation of the Kingdom with the Church. For this purpose all the necessary written evidence, and the pertinent parts of the new ordinal were submitted to the Pope. The Legation having been splendidly received and their evidence having been diligently discussed by several of the Cardinals, after mature deliberation Paul IV issued his Bull *Praeclara Carissimi* on June 20, of that same year. In this, while giving full force and approbation to what Pole had done, it is ordered in the matter of the ordinations as follows: *Those who have been promoted to ecclesiastical orders by any one but by a Bishop validly and lawfully ordained are bound to receive those orders again;* but who those Bishops not *validly and*

adhibitae: ii nimirum qui ad episcopatum, sicut alii ad alios ordines, promoti essent, *non servatâ forma Ecclesiae consueta*, vel non servata *Ecclesiae forma et intentione*, prout Legatus ipse ad episcopum Norwicensem scribebat. Hi autem non alii profecto erant nisi qui promoti secundum novam ritualem formam; cui quoque examinandae delecti Cardinales attentam operam dederant. Neque praetermittendus est locus ex eisdem Pontificis litteris, omnino rei congruens; ubi cum aliis beneficio dispensationis egentibus numerantur qui *tam ordines quam beneficia ecclesiastica nulliter et de facto obtinuerant. Nulliter* enim obtinuisse ordines idem est atque irrito actu nulloque effectu, videlicet *invalide*, ut ipsa monet eius vocis notatio et consuetudo sermonis; praesertim quum idem pari modo affirmetur de ordinibus quod de *beneficiis ecclesiasticis*, quae ex certis sacrorum canonum institutis manifesto erant nulla, eo quia cum vitio infirmante collata. Huc accedit quod, ambigentibus nonnullis quinam revera episcopi, *rite et recte ordinati*, dici et haberi possent ad mentem Pontificis, hic non

lawfully ordained were had been made sufficiently clear by the foregoing documents, and the faculties used in the said matter by the Legate; those, namely, who have been promoted to the episcopate, as others to other orders, *not according to the accustomed form of the Church*, or, as the Legate himself wrote to the Bishop of Norwich, *the form and intention of the Church* not having been observed. These were certainly those promoted according to the new form of rite, to the examination of which the Cardinals specially deputed had given their careful attention. Neither should a passage, much to the point, in the same Pontifical letter, be overlooked, where, together with others needing dispensation, are enumerated those *who had obtained as well orders as benefices* "*nulliter et de facto.*" For to obtain orders *nulliter* means that they are an act null and void, that is invalid, as the very meaning of the word and as common usage of language require. This is especially clear when the word is used in the same way of orders as of *ecclesiastical benefices.* These, by the

multo post, die XXX octobris, alias subiecit litteras in modum Brevis: atque, *Nos*, inquit, *haesitationem huiusmodi tollere, et serenitati conscientiae eorum qui schismate durante ad ordines promoti fuerant, mentem et intentionem quam in eisdem litteris Nostris habuimus clarius exprimendo, opportune consulere volentes, declaramus eos tantum episcopos et archiepiscopos qui non in forma Ecclesiae ordinati et consecrati fuerunt, rite et recte ordinatos dici non posse.* Quae declaratio, nisi apposite ad rem Angliae praesentem, id est ad Ordinale eduardianum, spectare debuisset, nihil certe confecerat Pontifex novis litteris, quo vel *haesitationem tolleret* vel *serenitati conscientiae consuleret.* Ceterum Apostolicae Sedis documenta et mandata non aliter quidem Legatus intellexit, atque ita eis rite religioseque obtemperavit: idque pariter factum a regina Maria et a ceteris qui cum ea dederunt operam ut religio et instituta catholica pristinum locum restituerentur.

undoubted teaching of the sacred canons, were clearly null if given with any vitiating defect. Moreover, when some doubted as to who, according to the mind of the Pontiff, could be called and considered Bishops *validly and lawfully ordained*, the said Pope shortly after, on October 30, issued further letters in the form of a brief, and said: *We, wishing to remove the doubt, and to opportunely provide for the peace of conscience of those who, during the schism, were promoted to orders, by expressing more clearly the mind and intention which we had in the aforesaid letters, declare that only those Bishops and Archbishops who were not ordained and consecrated in the form of the Church cannot be said to be validly and lawfully ordained.* Unless this declaration had applied to the actual case in England —that is to say, to the Edwardine Ordinal—the Pope would certainly have done nothing by these last letters *for the removal of doubt, and the restoration of peace of conscience.* Further, it was in this sense that the Legate understood the documents

Auctoritates quas excitavimus Iulii III et Pauli IV aperte ostendunt initia eius disciplinae qua tenore constanti, iam tribus amplius saeculis, custodita est, ut ordinationes ritu Eduardiano, haberentur infectae et nullae; cui disciplinae amplissime suffragantur testimonia multa earumdem ordinationum quae, in hac etiam Urbe, saepius absoluteque iteratae sunt ritu catholico.—In huius igitur disciplinae observantia vis inest opportuna proposito. Nam si cui forte quidquam dubitationis resideat in quamnam vere sententiam ea Pontificum diplomata sint accipienda, recte illud valet: *Consuetudo optima legum interpres.* Quoniam vero firmum semper ratumque in Ecclesia mansit. Ordinis sacramentum nefas esse iterari, fieri nullo pacto poterat ut talem consuetudinem Apostolica Sedes pateretur tacita ac tolerrret. Atqui eam non toleravit solum, sed probavit etiam et sanxit ipsa, quotiescumque in eadem re peculiare aliquod factum inci-

and commands of the Apostolic See, and duly and conscientiously obeyed them; and the same was done by Queen Mary and the rest who helped to restore the Catholic religion to its former state.

The authority of Julius III and Paul II, which we have quoted, clearly shows the origin of the practice, which has been observed without interruption for more than three centuries, that ordination according to the Edwardine rite should be considered null and void. This practice is fully proved by the numerous cases of absolute reordination according to the Catholic rite even in Rome. In the observance of this practice we have a proof directly affecting the matter in hand, for if by any chance doubt should remain as to the true sense in which these Pontifical documents are to be understood, the principle holds good that *custom is the best interpreter of law.* Since in the Church it has ever been a constant and established rule that it is sacrilegious to repeat the Sacrament of Orders, it never could have come to pass that the Apos-

dit indicandum. Duo eiusmodi facta in medium proferimus, ex multis quae ad *Supremam* sunt subinde delata: alterum, anno MDCLXXXIV, cuiusdam Calvinistae Galli, alterum, anno MDCCIV, Ioannis Clementis Gordon; utriusque secundum rituale Eduardianum suos adepti ordines. In primo, post accuratam rei investigationem, consultores non pauci responsa sua, quae appellant vota, de scripto ediderunt, ceterique cum eis in unam conspirarunt sententiam, *pro invaliditate ordinationis:* tantum quidem ratione habita opportunitatis, placuit Cardinalibus respondere, *Dilata.* Eadem vero acta repetita et ponderata sunt in facto altero: quaesita sunt praeterea nova consultorum vota, rogatique doctores egregii e Sorbonicis ac Duacenis, neque praesidium ullum perspicacioris prudentiae praetermissum est ad rem penitus pernoscendam. Atque hoc animadvertisse oportet quod, tametsi tum ipse Gordon cuius negotium erat, tum

tolic See should have silently acquiesced in and tolerated such a custom. But not only did the Apostolic See tolerate this practice, but approved and sanctioned it as often as any particular case arose which called for its judgment in the matter. We adduce two facts of this kind out of many which have from time to time been submitted to the Supreme Council of the Holy Office. The first was (in 1684) of a certain French Calvinist, and the other (1704) of John Clement Gordon, both of whom had received their orders according to the Edwardine ritual. In the first case, after a searching investigation the consultors, not a few in number, gave in writing their answer, or, as they call it, their *vota*, and the rest unanimously agreed with their conclusion, *for the invalidity of the ordination*, and only an account of reasons of opportuneness did the Cardinals deem it well to answer by a *dilata* (viz., not to formulate the conclusion at the moment). The same documents were called into use and considered again in the examination of the second case, and additional written statements

aliqui consultores inter causas *nullitatis* vindicandae etiam adduxissent illam prout putabatur ordinationem Parkerii, in sententia tamen ferenda omnino seposita est ea causa, ut documenta produnt integrae fidei, neque alia ratio est reputata nisi *defectus formae et intentionis.* Qua de forma quo plenius esset certiusque indicium, cautum fuerat ut exemplar Ordinalis anglicani suppeteret; atque etiam cum eo singulae collatae sunt formae ordinandi, ex variis orientalium et occidentalium ritibus conquisitae. Tum Clemens XI, Cardinalium ad quos pertinebat consentientibus suffragiis, ipsemet feria V, die XVII aprilis MDCCIV, *decrevit:* "Ioannes Clemens Gordon *ex integro et absolute* ordinetur ad omnes ordines etiam sacros et praecipue presbyteratus, et quatenus non fuerit confirmatus, prius sacramentum Confirmationis suscipiat." Quae sententia, id sane considerare refert, ne a defectu quidem *traditionis*

of opinion were also obtained from consultors, and the most eminent doctors of the Sorbonne and of the Douai universities were likewise asked for their opinion. No safeguard which wisdom and prudence could suggest to ensure the thorough sifting of the question was neglected.

And here it is important to observe that although Gordon himself, whose case it was, and some of the consultors had adduced amongst the reasons which went to prove invalidity, the ordination of Parker, according to their own ideas about it, in the delivery of the decision this reason was altogether set aside, as documents of incontestable authenticity prove. In pronouncing the decision weight was given to no other reason than the *defect of form and intention*, and, in order that the judgment concerning this form might be more certain and complete, precaution was taken that a copy of the Anglican ordinal should be submitted to examination, and that with it should be collated the ordination forms gathered together from the various Eastern and Western rites. Then Clement XI him-

instrumentorum quidquam momenti duxit: tunc enim praescriptum de more esset ut ordinatio *sub conditione* instauraretur. Eo autem pluris refert considerare, eamdem Pontificis sententiam spectare universe ad omnes Anglicanorum ordinationes. Licet enim factum attigerit peculiare, non tamen ex peculiari quapiam ratione profecta est, verum ex *vitio formae*, quo quidem vitio ordinationes illae aequa afficiuntur omnes: adeo ut, quoties deinceps in re simili decernendum fuit, toties idem Clementis XI communicatum sit decretum.

Quae quum ita sint, non videt nemo controversiam temporibus nostris exsuscitatam, Apostolicae Sedis iudicio definitam multo antea fuisse: documentisque illis haud satis quam oportuerat cognitis, fortasse factum ut scriptor aliquis catholicus disputationem de ea libere habere non dubitarit. Quoniam vero, ut principio monuimus, hihil Nobis antiquius

self, with the unanimous vote of the Cardinals concerned, on the *Feria V*, April 17th, 1704, decreed: "John Clement Gordon shall be ordained *from the beginning and unconditionally*, to all the orders, even sacred orders, and chiefly of priesthood, and in case he has not been confirmed he shall first receive the sacrament of Confirmation." It is important to bear in mind that this judgment was in no wise determined by the omission of the rite of handing over the instruments, for in such a case, according to the established custom, the direction would have been to repeat the ordination *conditionally*. Still more important it is to note that the judgment of the Pontiff applies universally to all Anglican ordinations, because although it refers to a particular case it is not based upon any reason special to that case, but upon the *defect of form*, which defect equally affects all these ordinations, so much so that when similar cases subsequently came up for decision the same decree of Clement XI was quoted as the rule to follow.

optatiusque est quam ut hominibus recte animatis maximâ possimus indulgentia et caritate prodesse, ideo iussimus in Ordinale anglicanum, quod caput est totius causae rursus quam studiosissime inquiri.

In ritu cuiuslibet conficiendi et administrandi iure discernunt inter partem *caeremonialem* et partem *essentialem* quae *materia et forma* appellari consuevit. Omnesque norunt, sacramenta novae legis, utpote signa sensibilia atque gratiae invisibilis efficientia, debere gratiam et significare quam efficiunt et efficere quam significant. Quae significatio, etsi in toto ritu essentiali, in materia scilicet et forma, haberi debet, praecipue tamen ad formam pertinet; quum materia sit pars per se non determinata, quae per illam determinetur. Idque in sacramento Ordinis manifestius apparet cuius conferendi materia, quatenus hoc loco se dat considerandam, est manuum impositio; quae quidem nihil definitum per se significat, et aeque ad

Hence it must be clear to everyone that the controversy lately revived had been already definitely settled by the Apostolic See, and that it is to the insufficient knowledge of these docuthat we must, perhaps, attribthe fact that any Catholic writer should have considered it still an open question. But, as We stated at the beginning, there is nothing We so deeply and ardently desire as to be of help to men of good will by showing them the greatest consideration and charity, wherefore We ordered that the Anglican ordinal, which is the essential point of the whole matter, should be at once most carefully examined.

In the examination of any rite for the effecting and administering of a sacrament, distinction is rightly made between the part which is *ceremonial* and that which is *essential*, usually called the "*matter and form.*" All know that the sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, ought both to signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found

quosdam Ordines, aeque ad Confirmationem usurpatur.— Iamvero verba quae ad proximam usque aetatem habentur passim ab Anglicanis tamquam forma propria ordinationis presbyteralis, videlicet, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, minime sane significant definite ordinem sacerdotii vel eius gratiam et protestatem, quae praecipue est potestas *consecrandi et offerendi verum corpus et sanguinem Domini*[1], eo sacrificio, quod non est *nuda commemoratio sacrificii in Cruce peracti.*[2] Forma huiusmodi aucta quidem est postea iis verbis, *ad officium et opus presbyteri:* sed hoc potius convincit, Anglicanos vidisse ipsos primam eam formam fuisse mancam neque idoneam rei. Eadem vero adiectio, si forte quidem legitimam significationem apponere formae posset, serius est inducta, elapso iam saeculo post receptum Ordinale

1 Trid. Sess. XXIII, *de sacr. Ord. can. 1.*

2. *Ib.* Sess. XXII, *de sacrif. Missae, can. 3.*

in the whole essential rite, that is to say, in the matter and form, it still pertains chiefly to the form, since the matter is the part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form; and this appears still more clearly in the Sacrament of Orders, the matter of which, in so far as we have to consider it in this case, is the imposition of hands, which indeed by itself signifies nothing definite, and is equally used for several orders, and for confirmation. But the words which, until recently, were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priestly ordination, namely: "*Receive the Holy Ghost*," certainly do not in the least definitely express the sacred order of priesthood or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power *of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord* (Council of Trent, Sess. XXIII, *De Sacr. Ord.*, Can. 1) in that sacrifice which is no "nude commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the cross" (Ibid. Sess. XXII., *De Sacrif. Missae*, Can. 3). This form had, indeed, afterwards added to it the words, "*for the office*

eduardianum; quum propterea, Hierarchiâ extincta, potestas ordinandi iam nulla esset. Nequidquam porro auxilium causae novissime arcessitum est ab aliis eiusdem Ordinalis precibus. Nam, ut cetera praetereantur quae eas demonstrent in ritu anglicano minus sufficientes proposito, unum hoc argumentum sit instar omnium, de ipsis consulto detractum esse quidquid in ritu catholico dignitatem et officia sacerdotii perspicue designat. Non ea igitur forma esse apta et sufficiens sacramento potest, quae id nempe reticet quod deberet proprium significare.

De consecratione episcopali similiter est. Nam formulae, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, non modo serius adnexa sunt verba, *ad officium et opus episcopi*, sed etiam de iisdem, ut mox dicemus, iudicandum aliter est quam in ritu catholico. Neque rei proficit quidquam advocasse praefationis precem, *Omnipotens Deus;* quum ea pariter deminuta sit verbis quae *sum-*

and work of a priest," etc., but this rather shows that the Anglicans themselves perceived that the first form was defective and inadequate. But even if this addition could give to the form its due signification, it was introduced too late, as a century had already elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine ordinal; for as the Hierarchy had become extinct there remained no power of ordaining. In vain has help been recently sought for the plea of the validity of orders from the other prayers of the same ordinal. For, to put aside other reasons which show this to be insufficient for the purpose in the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all, that from them has been deliberately removed whatever set forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite. That form consequently ought not to be considered apt or sufficient for the sacrament which omits what it ought essentially to signify.

It is the same with regard to episcopal consecration. To the form "*Receive the Holy Ghost*" the words "*for the office and work of a Bishop*" were added at a later period; but even these words, as We

mum sacerdotium declarent. Sane, nihil huc attinet explorare, utrum episcopatus complementum sit sacerdotii, an ordo ab illo distinctus: aut collatus, ut aiunt, *per saltum*, scilicet homini non sacerdoti, utrum effectum habeat necne. At ipse procul dubio, ex institutione Christi, ad sacramentum Ordinis verissime pertinet, atque est praecellenti gradu sacerdotium; quod nimirum et voce sanctorum Patrum et rituali nostra consuetudine *summum sacerdotium*, *sacri ministerii summa* nuncupatur. Inde fit ut, quoniam sacramentum Ordinis verumque Christi sacerdotium a ritu anglicano penitus extrusum est, atque adeo in consecratione episcopali eiusdem ritus nullo modo sacerdotium confertur, nullo item modo episcopatus vere ac iure possit conferri: eoque id magis |quia in primis episcopatus muniis illud scilicet est, ministros ordinandi in sanctam Eucharistiam et sacrificium.

Ad rectam vero plenamque

shall presently show, must be understood in a sense different to that which they bear in the Catholic rite. Nor is there anything gained by quoting "*Almighty God*," since it in like manner has been stripped of the words which denote the *High Priesthood*. It is not here relevant to examine whether the episcopate be a completion of the priesthood or an order distinct from it, or whether when bestowed as they say *per saltum* on one who is not a priest, it has or has not its effect. But the episcopate undoubtedly by the institution of Christ most truly belongs to the sacrament of orders, and constitutes the priesthood in the highest degree—namely, that which by the teachings of the holy Fathers and our Liturgical customs is called the *Summum Sacerdotium Sacri Ministerii Summa*.—["The High Priesthood, the Fullness of the Sacred Ministry."] Thus we find that, as the Sacrament of Orders and the true priesthood of Christ were utterly eliminated from the Anglican rite, and hence the priesthood is in no wise conferred truly and validly in the episcopal consecration of the same rite,

Ordinalis anglicani aestimationem, praeter ista per aliquas eius partes notata, nihil profecto tam valet quam si probe aestimetur quibus adiunctis rerum conditum sit et publice constitutum. Longum est singula persequi, neque est necessarium: eius namque aetatis memoria satis diserte loquitur, cuius animi essent in Ecclesiam catholicam auctores Ordinalis, quos adsciverint fautores ab heterodoxis sectis, quo demum consilia sua referrent. Nimis enimvero scientes quae necessitudo inter fidem et cultum inter *legem credendi et legem supplicandi* intercedat, liturgiae ordinem, specie quidem redintegrandae eius formae primaeva, ad errores Novatorum multis modis deformarunt. Quamobrem toto Ordinali non modo nulla est aperta mentio sacrificii, consecrationis, sacerdotii, potestatisque consecrandi et sacrificii offerendi; sed immo omnia huiusmodi rerum vestigia, quae superessent in precationibus

for the like reason, therefore, the episcopate can in no way be truly and validly conferred by it, and this the more so because among the duties of the episcopate is that of ordaining ministers for the Holy Eucharistic Sacrifice.

For the accurate and full understanding of the Anglican Ordinal, besides what we have noted as to some of its parts, it is worthy of note to consider carefully the circumstances under which it was composed and publicly authorized. It would be tedious to enter into details, nor is it necessary to do so, as the history of that time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church, as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects, and as to the end they had in view. Being fully aware of the necessary connection between faith and worship, between *the law of believing and the law of praying*, under a pretext of returning to the primitive form they corrupted in many ways the liturgical order to suit the errors of the reformers. For this reason in the whole Ordinal not only is

ritus catholici non plane reiectis, sublata et deleta sunt de industria, quod supra attigimus. Ita per se apparet nativa Ordinalis indoles ac spiritus, uti loquuntur. Hinc vero ab origine ducto vitio, si valere ad usum ordinationum minime potuit, nequaquam decursu aetatum, quam tale ipsum permanserit, futurum fuit ut valeret. Atque ii egerunt frustra qui inde a temporibus Caroli I. conati sunt admittere aliquid sacrificii et sacerdotii, nonnullâ dein ad Ordinale facta accessione: frustraque similiter contendit pars ea Anglicanorum non ita magna, recentiore tempore coalita, quae arbitratur posse idem Ordinale ad sanam rectamque sententiam intelligi et deduci. Vana, inquimus, fuere et sunt huiusmodi conata: idque hac etiam de causa, quod, si qua quidem verba, in Ordinali anglicano ut nunc est, porrigant se in ambiguum, ea tamen sumere sensum eumdem nequeunt quem habent in ritu catholico. Nam semel

there no clear mention of the Sacrifice, of consecration to the priesthood and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifices, but, as We have just stated, every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out. In this way the native character, or spirit, as it is called, of the Ordinal clearly manifests itself. Hence if vitiated in its origin it was wholly insufficient to confer orders. It was impossible that in the course of time it would become sufficient, since no change had taken place. In vain those who from the time of Charles I. have attempted to hold some kind of sacrifice or of priesthood have made some additions to the Ordinal. In vain also has been the contention of that small section of the Anglican body formed in recent times that the said Ordinal can be understood and interpreted in a sound and orthodox sense. Such efforts we affirm have been and are made in vain, and for this reason that any words in the Anglican Ordinal as it now is which lend themselves to am-

novato ritu, ut vidimus, quo nempe negetur vel adulteretur sacramentum Ordinis, et a quo quaevis notio repudiata sit consecrationis et sacrificii; iam minime constat formula, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, qui Spiritus, cum gratia nimirum sacramenti, in animam infunditur; minimeque constant verba illa, *ad officium et opus presbyteri* vel *episcopi* ac similia, quae restant nomina sine re quam instituit Christus.—Huius vim argumenti perspectam ipsi habent plerique Anglicani, observantiores Ordinalis interpretes; quam non dissimulanter eis obiiciunt qui nove ipsum interpretantes, Ordinibus inde collatis pretium virtutemque non suam spe vana affingunt. Eodem porro argumento vel uno illud etiam corruit, opinantium posse in legitimam Ordinis formam sufficere precationem, *Omnipotens Deus, bonorum omnium largitor*, quae sub initium est ritualis actionis; etiamsi forte haberi ea posset tamquam sufficiens

biguity cannot be taken in the same sense as they possess in the Catholic rite. For once a new rite has been instituted in which, as we have seen, the Sacrament of Orders is adulterated or denied, and from which all idea of consecration and sacrifice has been rejected the formula, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, no longer holds good, because the Spirit is infused into the soul with the grace of the Sacrament; and the words *for the office and work of a priest or bishop*, and the like, no longer hold good, but remain as words without the reality which Christ instituted. Several of the more shrewd Anglican interpreters of the Ordinal have perceived the force of this argument, and they openly urge it against those who take the Ordinal in a new sense, and vainly attach to the orders conferred thereby a value and efficiency they do not possess. By this same argument is refuted the contention of those who think that the prayer "*Almighty God giver of all good things*," which is found at the beginning of the ritual action, might suffice as a legitimate form of orders, even in the hypothesis that it might

in ritu aliquo catholico quem Ecclesia probasset.—Cum hoc igitur intimo *formae defectu* coniunctus est *defectus intentionis*, quam aeque necessario postulat, ut sit, sacramentum. De mente vel intentione, utpote quae per se quiddam est interius, Ecclesia non iudicat: at quatenus extra proditur, iudicare de ea debet. Iamvero quum quis ad sacramentum conficiendum et conferendum materiam formamque debitam serio ac rite abhibuit, eo ipso censetur id nimirum facere intendisse quod facit Ecclesia. Quo sane principio, innititur doctrina quae tenet esse vere sacramentum vel illud, quod ministerio hominis haeretici aut non baptizati, dummodo ritu catholico, conferatur. Contra, si ritus immutetur, eo manifesto consilio ut alius inducatur ab Ecclesia non receptus, utque id repellatur quod facit Ecclesia et quod ex institutione Christi ad naturam attinet sacramenti, tunc palam est, non solum necessariam sacramento inbe held to be sufficient in a Catholic rite approved by the Church. With this inherent *defect of form* is joined the *defect of intention*, which is usually essential to the Sacraments. The Church does not judge about the mind and intention in so far as it is something by its nature internal, but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge concerning it. When any one has rightly and seriously made use of due form and the matter requisite for effecting or conferring the Sacrament he is considered by the very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized provided the Catholic rite be employed. On the other hand, if the rite be changed with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then, it is clear, that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is ad-

tentionem deesse, sed intentionem immo haberi sacramento adversam et repugnantem.

Isthaec omnia diu multumque reputavimus apud Nos et cum Venerabilibus Fratribus Nostris in *Suprema* iudicibus; quorum etiam Coetum singulariter coram Nobis advocare placuit feria V, die XVI iulii proximi, in commemoratione Mariae D. N. Carmelitidis. Iique ad unum consensere, propositam causam iam pridem ab Apostolica Sede plene fuisse et cognitam et iudicatam : eius autem denuo instituta actâque quaestione, emersisse illustrius quanto illa iustitiae sapientiaeque pondere totam rem absolvisset. Verumtamen optimum factu duximus supersedere sententiae, quo et melius perpenderemus conveniret ne expediretque eamdem rem auctoritate Nostra rursus declarari, et uberiorem divini luminis copiam supplices imploraremus.—Tum considerantibus Nobis ut idem caput disciplinae, etsi iure iam deiverse to and destructive of the Sacrament.

All these matters have been long and carefully considered by Ourselves and by Our venerable brethren, the Judges of the Supreme Council of whom it has pleased Us to call a special meeting on Thursday, the 16th day of July last, feast of the Solemnity of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. They, with one accord, agreed that the question laid before them had been adjudicated upon with full knowledge of the Apostolic See, and that this renewed discussion and examination of the issue had only served to bring out more clearly the wisdom and accuracy with which that decision had been made. Nevertheless, We deemed it well to postpone a decision, in order to afford time both to consider whether it would be fitting or expedient that We should make a fresh authoritative declaration upon the matter, and to humbly pray for a fuller measure of Divine guidance. Then, considering that this matter of practice, although already decided, had been by certain persons for whatever reasons recalled

nitum, a quibusdam revocatum sit in controversiam, quacumque demum causa sit revocatum ; ex eoque pronum fore ut perniciosus error gignatur non paucis qui putent se ibi Ordinis sacramentum et fructus reperire ubi minime sunt, visum est in Domino sententiam Nostram edicere.

Itaque omnibus Pontificum Decessorum in hac ipsa causa decretis usquequaqua assentientes, eaque plenissime confirmantes ac veluti renovantes auctoritate Nostra, motu proprio certa scientia, pronunciamus et declaramus, Ordinationes ritu anglicano actas, irritas prorsus fuisse et esse, omninoque nullas.

Hoc restat, ut quo ingressi sumus *Pastoris magni* nomine et animo veritatem tam gravis r e i certissimam commonstrare, eodem adhortemur eos qui Ordinum atque Hierarchiae beneficia sincera voluntate optent ac requirant. Usque adhuc fortasse, virtutis christianae intendentes ardorem, religiosius consulentes divinas litteras, pias dupli-

into discussion, and that thence it might follow that a pernicious error would be fostered in the minds of many who might suppose that they possessed the Sacraments and effects of Orders where those are nowise to be found, it has seemed good to Us in the Lord to pronounce Our judgment.

Wherefore, strictly adhering in this matter to the decrees of the Pontiffs, Our predecessors, and confirming them more fully, and as it were, renewing them by Our authority, of Our own free will and from certain knowledge, We pronounce and declare that ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rites, have been, and are absolutely null and utterly void. It remains for Us to say that even as We have entered upon the elucidation of this grave question in the name and in the love of the Great Shepherd, in the same we appeal to those who desire and seek with a sincere heart the possession of a hierarchy and of Orders. Perhaps, until now, aiming at the greater perfection of Christian virtue, and searching more devoutly the Divine Scriptures, and redoubling

cantes preces, incerti tamen haeserunt et anxii ad vocem Christi iamdiu intime admonentis. Probe iam vident quo se bonus ille invitet ac velit. Ad unicum eius ovile si redeant, tum vero et quaesita beneficia assecuturi sunt et consequentia salutis praesidia, quorum administram fecit ipse Ecclesiam, quasi redemptionis suae custodem perpetuam et procuratricem in gentibus. Tum vero *haurient aquas in gaudio de fontibus Salvatoris*, sacramentis eius mirificis; unde fideles animae in amicitiam Dei, remissis vere peccatis, restituuntur, caelesti pane aluntur et roborantur, adiumentisque maximis affluunt ad vitae adeptionem aeternae. Quorum bonorum revera sitientes, utinam *Deus pacis*, *Deus totius consolationis* faciat compotes atque expleat perbenignus.—Hortationem vero Nostram et vota eos maiorem in modum spectare volumus, qui religionis ministri in communitatibus suis habentur. Homines ex ipso officio praecedentes

the fervor of their prayers, they have nevertheless hesitated in doubt and anxiety to follow the voice of Christ which has so long interiorly admonished them. Now, they see clearly whither He in His goodness invited them, and wills them to come. In returning to His one only fold they will obtain the blessings which they seek and the consequent helps to salvation of which He has made the Church the dispenser, and, as it were, the constant guardian and promoter of His redemption among the nations. Then, indeed, "they shall draw waters in joy from the fountains of the Saviour," His wondrous sacraments, whereby His faithful souls have their sins truly remitted and restored to the friendship of God, are nourished and strengthened by the Heavenly Bread, and abound with the most powerful aids for their eternal salvation. May the God of peace, the God of all consolation, in His infinite tenderness enrich and fill with these blessings those who truly yearn for them. We wish to direct Our exhortation and Our desires in a special way

doctrina et auctoritate, quibus profecto cordi est divina gloria et animarum salus, velint alacres vocanti Deo parere in primis et obsequi, praeclarumque de se edere exemplum. Singulari certe laetitia eos Ecclesia mater excipiet omnique complectetur bonitate et providentia, quippe quos per arduas rerum difficultates virtus animi generosior ad sinum suum reduxerit. Ex hac vero virtute dici vix potest quae ipsos laus maneat in coetibus fratrum per catholicum orbem, quae aliquando spes et fiducia ante Christum iudicem, quae ab illo praemia in regno caelesti! Nos quidem, quantum omni ope licuerit, eorum cum Ecclesia reconciliationem fovere non desistemus; ex qua et singuli et ordines, id quod vehementer cupimus, multum capere possunt ad imitandum. Interea veritatis gratiaeque divinae patentem cursum ut secundare contendant fideliter, per viscera misericordiae Dei nostri rogamus omnes et obsecramus.

to those who are ministers of religion in their respective communities. They are men who from their very office take precedence in learning and authority, and who have at heart the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

Let them be the first in joyfully submitting to the Divine call, and obey it and furnish a glorious example to others. Assuredly with an exceeding great joy their mother the Church will welcome them, and will cherish with all her love and care those whom the strength of their generous souls has amidst many trials and difficulties led back to her bosom. Nor could words express the recognition which this devoted courage will win for them from the assemblies of the brethren throughout the Catholic world, or what hope or confidence it will merit for them before Christ as their Judge, or what reward it will obtain from Him in the Heavenly Kingdom. And We Ourselves in every lawful way shall continue to promote their reconciliation with the Church in which individuals and masses, as we ardently desire, may find so much for their imitation. In

Praesentes vero litteras et quaecumque in ipsis habentur nullo unquam tempore de subreptionis aut obreptionis sive intentionis Nostrae vitio aliove quovis defectu notari vel impugnari posse ; sed semper validas et in suo robore fore et esse, atque ab omnibus cuiusvis gradus et praeeminentiae inviolabiliter in iudicio et extra observari debere decernimus : irritum quoque et inane si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate vel praetextu, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari declarantes, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Volumus autem ut harum litterarum exemplis, etiam impressis, manu tamen Notarii subscriptis et per constitutum in ecclesiastica dignitate virum sigillo munitis, eadem habeatur fides quae Nostrae voluntatis significationi his praesentibus ostensis haberetur.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo octingentesimo nonagesimo sex-

the meantime, by the tender mercy of the Lord Our God, We ask and beseech all to strive faithfully to follow in the open path of Divine grace and truth.

We decree that these letters and all things contained therein shall not be liable at any time to be impugned or objected to by reason of fault or any other defect whatsoever of subreption or obreption, or of Our intention, but are and shall be always valid and in force, and shall be inviolably observed both judicially and otherwise by all of whatsoever degree and pre-eminence, declaring null and void anything which in these matters may happen to be contrariwise attempted, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by any person whatsoever, by whatsoever authority or pretext, all things to the contrary notwithstanding.

We will that there shall be given to copies of these letters, even printed, provided that they be signed by a notary and sealed by a person constituted in ecclesiastical dignity, the same credence that would be given to the expression of Our will by the showing of these presents.

to, idibus septembribus, Pontificatus Nostri anno decimo nono.

† A *Card.* BIANCHI,
† C *Card.* DE RVGGIERO,
Pro-Datarius (*Visa*)
De Cvria I. DE AQVILA,
E Vicecomitibus.
Loco ✠ *Plumbi*
Reg. in Secret. Brevium.
I. CVGNONI.

Given at Rome, at St. Peters', in the year of the Incarnation of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six, on the Ides of September, in the nineteenth year of Our Pontificate.

† C *Card.* DE RUGGIERO,
† A *Card.* BIANCI,
Pro-Datarius (*Visa.*)
[SEAL.] J. DELLA AQUILA,
Visconti.
Registered in the Secretariate of Briefs.
J. CUGNONI.

THE UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP SEGHERS.

Concluded.

ON June 29, 1873, Father Seghers was consecrated Bishop of Vancouver's Island in his Cathedral at Victoria. What a consolation it would have been to the young prelate, after the solemn ceremonies, to communicate his feelings of hope and anxiety to his beloved Father De Neve, and to lay open to him his plans and schemes for the conversion of his dear Indians, now that he was his own master, and could, unreservedly and unsparingly, devote himself to missionary labors! But the wise and gentle Rector of Louvain College had been stricken down, in the meantime, with a serious illness, which deprived him of the full use of his mental faculties, and, in consequence, obliged him to retire from active duty. What a pity! We would now have, here in Louvain, a collection of letters that would give us an insight into the

royal, episcopal heart of Charles Seghers, a pleasure we must forego until we meet him in heaven.

Although Mgr. De Neve returned to Louvain in 1882 and again assumed the Rectorship, the correspondence between him and the Archbishop seems to lack that affectionate tenderness and intimacy which characterized former letters. Still we find sufficient material in the archives of the College to give us interesting glimpses of his lofty aspirations and the holy motives which actuated all his episcopal labors and stamped his life with the seal of sanctity. A great friend and former school-mate of Bishop Seghers, now the librarian at the Jesuit College in Louvain, congratulated him on his elevation to the episcopate. The new prelate answered, in October, 1873, thanking the good Father "for the proof of his continued friendship and affection," but expressing his "confusion at the profusion of praise and eulogy."

"Do not write such things in the future. It is true to be Bishop is to be the chosen one of Divine Providence, but only to share more abundantly the chalice and cross of the Saviour, and I would do you a poor service if I wished that you should ever experience it. Etre évêque c' est bien etre l'élu de la Divine Providence; mais pour participer davantage au calice et a la croix du Sauveur; et je vous rendrais un mauvais service, si je vous souhaitai d'en jamais faire l'experience."

He sends his regards to his old Professors in the Society of Jesus, and remarks that it is "a real pleasure for him to think of all the good these true servants of God have done for him, and he assures them of his prayers, and begs them to likewise remember their former pupil. He then speaks of his sincere veneration and love for the order of St. Ignatius, and tells how he would have become a Jesuit, did he consider himself worthy of so great an honor. "The idea of joining your Society was probably a vain illusion, which God made use of, to direct me to the Missions, to which I do not cease to devote all my affections. I expect a continuance of your friendship, but—no more eulogies." "Humilitas honorata, rara virtus." In May of the following year he

wrote to Father Pulsers, who had been placed in charge of the College, asking for missionary help, and giving a few particulars about his apostolic efforts.

"This Diocese was solemnly consecrated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus on the festival of Easter, and on the following Sunday I left with Father Brabant to visit the western shores of this island, washed by the Pacific Ocean and inhabited by a race of Indians, the most savage and cruel on the Pacific coast. To relate their crimes, their deeds of cruelty would make your hair stand on end. They number about four thousand. They had never been visited by a priest, and had never heard preached the Christian doctrine.

"When leaving Victoria, we were prepared for everything, even for martyrdom. And, wonderful to say, the Indians received us everywhere with unmistakable tokens of respect and even dread. They all promise to become Christians; they all know the sign of the cross; several camps know the Lord's Prayer, and one camp even knows the Hail Mary—all this in their own language. We baptized eight hundred and eighty-two children. We may ascribe such good results to our consecration to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Select for this Diocese, Very Rev. Father, students of good will; men who are anxious to teach and evangelize Indians; who are prepared to meet privations, though they need not be afraid that they will starve. During our trip of five weeks in a small schooner, fifty feet long, on the billows of old Ocean, we had every day, thank God, all the necessaries of life. We slept on the bare ground occasionally; but what is that when it gives you the means of sanctifying the souls of eight hundred and eighty-two little ones? Select students who are willing to forget not only their home but also their nationality—'Missionarii Patria Christi Dei Ecclesia'—who are willing to toil in that portion of the Lord's vineyard, where their presence is deemed necessary. The wants of the Diocese are: two priests for the West Coast, two for Alaska Territory, one for Nanaimo. I speak of immediate wants, not of such as will arise in a not distant future. I trust these particulars will be sufficient to direct you in the choice of priests for this Diocese."

Father Brabant, the valiant Indian Missionary, was murderously attacked by an excited Chief, who fired several shots at him. But the brave priest, who is still working zealously

among the savages, recovered from his dangerous wounds through the anxious cares and prayers of his Ordinary.

In January, 1876, Bishop Seghers wrote to his former fellow student, now the Procurator at the College:

"I am at present among the Indians of Carvichan, to whom I brought last week a splendid oil painting for their Church. I blessed it yesterday and put it in its place, to the great satisfaction and joy of these good children of the forest. I have felt much pleasure in receiving good news about Father De Neve's health. May Almighty God condescend to hear our prayers and restore him entirely the precious mental faculties he has lost in His service. You are, I am sure, aware of the accident that happened to Father Brabant. He is now, thank Heaven, perfectly well and able to celebrate Mass. You ought to exert yourself and help me to secure efficient priests. What can I do here if you send me no assistance from Louvain? Now, for God's sake, do not forget your friend of old, his Diocese and his flock! If I had lost Father Brabant what would I have done, after all the sacrifices we have made on the West Coast? The other day, I sent a kind of appeal to the "Bien Public" at Ghent, but I do not know whether that journal published it or not.

"At all events, you ought to assist me; if you do not, I may be obliged to go abroad and travel after priests, which would be painful to me, and, I am afraid, not a little injurious to the interests of our missions."

From June, 1877, to September, 1878, Bishop Seghers was absent from Victoria on a "missionary trip" through the wilds of Alaska in quest of souls. He visited thirty thousand Indians during that period, and after untold sufferings and privations among the savages in the interior of that distant country emerged sound and safe at St. Michael's Redoubt, a place consisting of three or four shanties and inhabited by a few white people. There he heard of the death of Pius IX and the election of his successor, which had occurred nearly half a year before. From this lonely spot the apostolic prelate wrote on the "glorious Fourth" a pastoral letter, which was never printed, but which surely deserves to be published. Through the kindness of the pres-

ent Bishop of Vancouver Island, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Lemmens, the American College possesses a copy.

CHARLES JOHN SEGHERS,

through the grace of God and the Apostolical See Bishop of Vancouver Island, to the Clergy and Laity of his diocese, health and blessing.

It is with unqualified joy, Dearly Beloved, that we see the day draw near on which, with the help of God, we shall be once more in your midst. That we have been preserved from many dangers we shall not deny; that we partially owe that favor to your pious and unceasing prayers in our behalf, we fondly believe, and in return we thank God and we thank you, Beloved Brethren, for this peculiar assistance from heaven. We wish we had been amongst you when the sad news of the unexpected demise of the great Pontiff, Pius IX, reached Vancouver Island. We wish we had been amongst you to bewail that glorious and well-beloved Pastor of the whole Church: We wish we had been there to rejoice with you over the speedy elevation, so successfully achieved among the most ominous circumstances, of a successor worthy to take the place of the lamented Pontiff. But God has willed it otherwise, and let His holy will be done in all things on earth as it is in heaven. In a short time we shall, God permitting, resume and discharge our duties as before; take part in your trials; assist you in carrying your crosses; encourage you in your noble undertakings on behalf of the Church, and attend to the salvation of our own soul, by not disregarding the spiritual and eternal interests of your immortal souls. In the meantime, we exhort you to continue to exercise, as you have ever done, your unflinching fidelity and your unwavering loyalty to the Church. We need not announce to you the joyful tidings; you learned them before we did.

"Habemus Pontificem." We have a Supreme Pontiff, one whose life, whose administrative career, whose acknowl-

edged abilities, learning and sanctity, whose very name appears to tell us that he will lead the flock of Christ to victory and triumph. We shall not, Beloved Brethren, announce and predict that a speedy triumph will crown the struggles and tribulations which the Church now encounters; "Non est vestrum," said Christ to his Apostles, "it is not given to you to know at what time and at what hour God will work the wonders which are expected from His power." Act. Ap. i, 7. "Let God Himself choose His own time." "Omnia opera Domini bona," says Ecclesiasticus, "all the works of the Lord are good, and He shall achieve each one at the proper time, and at the proper hour." Eccli. xxxix, 39. But what we do announce to you is that it depends on you to accelerate and accomplish the triumph of the Church. Let each one of you triumph over his evil inclinations, over his unruly passions, over his sinful attachments; let every Christian triumph over the temptations, suggestions and snares of the evil spirit; will not then the Church really triumph over the gates of hell?

For what is the Church on earth? Is it not the gathering of all true Christians, united in the bonds of faith and of charity, under one visible and supreme Pontiff? If then every true Christian triumphs in himself over the attacks of the evil one, is it not plain that the whole Church triumphs over the combined efforts of the gates of hell? This, Beloved Brethren, is the true victory which the Church has to obtain in the world. For, we say, with a pious writer (Father Faber) that the Church is substantially, pre-eminently and principally a soul-saving institution of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Let every member of the Church walk in the true path that leads to heaven, and wealth and power and influence will be granted to the Church from on high, as much as is conducive to the salvation of mankind and no more; for more would prove unnecessary, dangerous, and perhaps injurious. We have seen, Beloved Brethren, in these latter times, members of the Church, men of learning, of eloquence and of influence, more concerned about the victory to be obtained by the Church, than about the triumph to be

achieved by them over their own spiritual enemies, pretending to know better how the Church has to conquer than the Supreme Pastor, assisted by the Holy Ghost; presuming to instruct, to teach and advise the Supreme Teacher and adviser of all the faithful—we have seen them—I say, extending their unholy hands to uphold the leaning ark of God, and we have seen them, like Oza, struck dead, not indeed with the death of the body, but with the spiritual death of the soul, death which, by means of a spiritual suicide, they inflicted on their own souls, by estranging themselves from the chosen people of God.

"Plangite eum," says Jeremias, xxii, 10, "qui egreditur;" weep over the one who goes away, "quia non revertetur ultra," for he shall no more return, "nec videbit terram nativitatis suae," and he shall see no more the land of his spiritual birth, the Church. Yes, we know, and the Apostle of the Gentiles has told us, that the conversion of apostates is extremely difficult. (Hebr. vi, 4.) Let their downfall be a warning; let their apostacy teach us how dangerous it is to be so busily engaged, and so restlessly concerned about the Church, and at the same time to lose sight of oneself, of one's own danger, of one's own temptations. Let everyone be humble, and the Church will be exalted, for it is written: "He that humbleth himself shall be exhalted." (Luke xviii, 14.) Let everyone be chaste and pure, and the Church will see God display His power and His glory, for of the pure of heart it is said that they shall see God. (Matth. v, 8.)

Let everyone conquer his thirst after wealth and riches, and rather choose to be poor with the righteous, than be unjustly rich with the wicked, and the Church will see Jesus Christ vanquish, reign, triumph, for it is said that the kingdom of heaven is of the poor in spirit. (Matth. v, 3.)

In the meantime, we do not intend, Beloved Brethren, to dissuade you from concerning yourselves about the Church, from assisting her with your prayers, with your pence, and with all the means in your power. But what we endeavor to deeply inculcate in your minds, is the necessity and obli-

gation of first taking care of your own sanctification, of busying yourselves chiefly about your own salvation, of working earnestly for your own spiritual perfection, and of leaving to the all-wise dispositions of the all-ruling providence of God, the care to honor His Church, at the proper time, with the respect, the esteem and the deference of nations. Offer your prayers for that object, Beloved Brethren, and offer them also for us, for the success of Our undertakings, for the conversion of the infidels still dwelling on Our vast diocese; and rest assured that we cease not to pray for you with all earnestness and fervor; for with the prophet Samuel we exclaim "Absit a me hoc peccatum." May God preserve me from committing the sin of ceasing to pray for you! (I Reg. xii, 23); and as a pledge of Our incessant prayers on your behalf, we grant you all Our blessing, "Benedictio Domini divites facit" (Prov. x, 22). The blessing of God will render you rich, rich in virtue, rich in grace, rich in merits and consequently rich in glory.

Written, signed and sealed by Us,
at St. Michael's Redoubt, Alaska,
on this 4th day of July, eighteen hundred and seventy-eight.
(Signed) ✠ CHARLES JOHN,
Bishop of Vancouver Island.

He was soon to be separated from his beloved Diocese, being appointed Coadjutor Archbishop of Oregon. He arrived in Portland, July 1, 1879, and ten days after started on a long episcopal journey through Idaho and Montana. On January 12, 1880, he writes to Louvain from the Umatilla Reservation: "I am here to attend to the very unsettled affairs of the Umatilla Indians, and, after a few days, I shall be in hot water again at Astoria." Despite trials and vexations of every kind, he found time for study and thought of books; for, in the same letter, he asks his Rev. friend at Louvain to buy and send him the complete works of St. Bonaventure, Cornelius a Lapide and Bellarmine. His motto was: "A Bishop without books is like a soldier

without arms." "My traveling is over," he writes Decem-12, 1880:

"I am gradually settling down at Portland, where, please God, I will, after allowing a slow process of an almost imperceptible transition, take the administration into my own hands. Pray that God may fit my hands for His work and my back for the cross. It would be well to dissuade the students of the American College from buying the 'Excerpta ex Rituali Romano' unless they have a complete Ritual. Some 'Excerpta' do not even contain the manner of giving Holy Communion 'extra Missam.' Indeed, I thought more than once that it would be well to prohibit those 'Excerpta' altogether. Some young priests sell their books before leaving for the missions. What a mistake! I heard more than one express his regret at having done so. I wish you would be good enough to see to that, and not only not allow young Missionaries to sell their books, but even encourage them to buy new ones; for, books are more needed here in America than in Europe. There you can easily consult some learned and experienced person, but here young missionaries have frequently nobody to consult except their books."

To a student of the College, whom he had adopted for Oregon, the Archbishop wrote characteristically: "I promise you little money, but much work, and a prospect of a rich reward in Heaven." In January, 1882, he rejoices at the return of Mgr. De Neve to Louvain and promises him "to stand by the College as faithfully as ever." On July 23, he dates his letter, "Missoulo, Montana." "I am, as you see, away from Portland, on an episcopal visit, after crossing the Coeur d'Alene Mountains on horse-back, a ride of six days. Next week, please God, I will visit for the second time, the St. Mary's Mission among the Flat-Heads, founded by Father DeSmet. I hope our Lord will illumine your mind with the unerring light of His grace." On the following November he wrote to the Rector from "Silver City, Idaho": "I received your letter in Boise City. Having commenced my pastoral visit on the fifth of last June, I do not expect to reach Portland before December." He gives a

detailed account of meeting some old parishioners of the Rector, in the Rocky Mountains, and closes with the good advice to "deeply inculcate into the minds of the students, that the Bishops, although they are sometimes compelled to reprove their priests, are always the best friends of the latter." Ever anxious for the welfare of "the dear old College," he suggests, in a letter dated May 10, 1883, to the venerable Rector, the need of a coadjutor:

"I am inclined to think the time has arrived to procure for yourself an assistant, whom you will prepare to eventually replace you. 'Quae audisti a me per multos testes, haec commenda fidelibus hominibus, qui idonei sunt et alios docere': those words may be applicable to you for your work must be continued even should your health give way. I am only making a suggestion and shall be glad to hear from you on the subject."

Preparatory to the third Council of Baltimore, all the American Archbishops were summoned to Rome. Archbishop Seghers had to suspend his gigantic labors for a few months and obey the papal mandate. "It was by way of a joke," he said in a letter of July 18, "that I promised my aunt I would return to Belgium to see her; but Divine Providence turns it into real earnest. The request to go to Rome is so urgent that I am already preparing myself for the trip. Ora pro me!" He arrived in Ghent, towards the end of October, at his uncle's, who had not ceased to "help" his nephew, though now an Archbishop, and who furnished him the necessary money to continue his journey to the Eternal City. During the first days of his Roman sojourn, he had an interview with the Prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Simeoni, who consulted him about his former Diocese, now vacant by the change of Bishop Brondel to Montana. "What shall we do with the abandoned Alaska," asked the Cardinal; to which the Archbishop replied: "Ecce ego, mitte me." On the evening of the same day, he wrote a letter to the Prefect in which he repeated his heroic offer of renouncing the Archbishopric of Oregon and return-

ing to his first love, Victoria, and to his forsaken children of Alaska. We copy this letter from the work of Dr. De Bacts, who was authorized by the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda to have the original letter photographed.

Ex aedibus Collegii Belgici, via dicta del Quirinale, die 18 Novembris 1883.

Eminentissimo ac Reverendissimo Patri Domino D. Joanni Cardinali Simeoni Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda fide Praefecto.

EMINENTISSIME AC REVERENDISSIME DOMINE:—Non ignorat Eminentia Tua me ab anno 1863 in missionibus Diocesis Vancouveriensis et Territorii Alaskae, sive America Muscovitica, laborasse usque ad annum 1879; quo tempore me promotum esse ad Coadjutoriam Archiepiscopi Oregonapolitani cum jure successionis pariter notum est Eminentiae Tuae. Porro huic translationi assensum non dedissem nisi per adimpletionem voluntatis Summi Pontificis adimpleri putassem voluntatem divinam. Sed translato nuper Revmo. Episcopo J. B. Brondel a Diocesi Vancouveriensi ad administrationem Vicariatus Apostolici Montanensis, atque aegrotante Rev. Admodum Dno. J. J. Jonckan, qui renuntiatus erat Coadjutor ejusdem Episcopi Vancouveriensis, ipsa Vancouveriensis ecclesia manet in statu viduitatis cum magno religionis detrimento, praecipue quoad missiones supradicti Territorii Alaskae, jam ab omnibus derelicti. Equidem considerans ex una parte non ita facile fore idoneum reperire Pastorem pro Diocesi Vancouveriensi, qui et Territorii Alaskae curam gerat, atque ex altera parte confidens nominationem alterius Archiepiscopi Oregonopolitani vix aliquas involvere difficultates, tanquam gratiam et favorem Eminentiam Tuam rogo, impellento amore quo semper supradictam ecclesiam Vancouveriensem prosecutus sum, ut Sancta Sedes Apostolica liberum me faciat, ut relicta sede Metropolitana Oregonopolitana, redire valeam ad Episcopatum Vancouveriensem. Neque est res hujusmodi insolita in Ecclesia. Nam S. Livinus, qui dicitur fuisse Episcopus Dubliniensis, in Hibernia, abscedens a sua sede episcopali, legitur appulisse ad oras Belgicas conversioni laboraturus

gentis barbaricae circa Gandovum, civitatem meam natalem, cujuc idem Sanctus colitur Patronus. Atque S. Bonifacius, relicto Archiepiscopatu Moguntino, et subrogato sibi Lullio, fertur transiisse ad Frisones. Quod si Eminentia Tua postulationem meam acceptandam atque Summo Pontifici offerendam censere dignetur, absoluto scilicet Revmo. Episcopo Brondel a sede, cui ligatus est, Vancouveriensi, humiliter atque instanter precor ut quamprimum negotium hoc absolvatur, eo fine, ut, dum in Europa maneo, presbyteros, nummos, paramenta, aliasque res mihi comparem, quae ad missiones in Alaska fundandas erunt necessariae.

Eminentiae Tuae
humilis in Christo Servus,
CAR. JO. SEGHERS,
Arch. Oregonop.

When Leo XIII heard from the lips of the Archbishop himself his noble resolution, he was moved to tears, and cheerfully approved the self-sacrificing heroism of the apostolic prelate. He left Rome, with the blessings of the Sovereign Pontiff, and on his way to Belgium stopped at Lourdes to invoke the assistance of Our Immaculate Mother on his missionary projects. In Louvain, he saw, "after fourteen years of separation"--and, oh! what hard years they were—his beloved "Father Rector!" He now began a "collection trip" through Belgium, and his countrymen, ever generous and whole-souled, nobly responded to his pleadings. He then crossed the Channel and canvassed England and Ireland for the same purpose. It was a long and tedious work. In July he wrote from Liverpool "requesting the professors and students of the college to say the 'Ave Maris Stella' for him during his journey of five months." A letter, dated Montreal, Canada, October 21st, announces that he got a good collection there for his needy Alaska. "Next week, God willing, I leave for Baltimore, where letters will find me "Care of Archbishop Gibbons." He writes November 2d: "Archbishop's House, Baltimore: 'I had to suspend my work of collecting on account of the business of the Council.

We are here, eight Bishops from the American College of Louvain.'" The news of his resignation was received in Oregon with mingled feelings of regret and admiration. Those who best knew and realized his extraordinary qualities of mind and heart were sincerely grieved. One of his priests, an old Louvain student, wrote to the rector: "We shall lose our dear Archbishop. What a calamity for Oregon! We prayed so hard for his happy voyage to Rome and his safe return to us; and, now our fondest hopes are frustrated. It is a cross almost too heavy for us to bear."

After settling his affairs in Oregon and bidding priests and people an affectionate farewell, he arrived, April 1, 1885, at Victoria, whence he wrote the May following: "I am at home since April first, and have been at work ever since. Please ask the students to make a Novena to St. Ann for our Indian Mission at Carvichan, which is in a deplorable condition." On August 22, he wrote: "Since my arrival at Victoria I have commenced the building of a new residence for myself and clergy. Father Lemmens is building a chapel 20 by 15 feet which can be used as a school, a sliding door shutting off the altar. Next month, please God, I will leave for the South of Alaska, where I will prepare everything for the permanent location of two missionary priests. About April of next year, I will commence operations, 'Deo dante,' in the West of Alaska." The following month he dates his letter, Juneau, Alaska Territory, September 21, 1885:

"I am here in a log cabin 12 by 12, about eight hundred and fifty miles from Victoria. I did not reach a very high latitude on this trip, as I went only to 59° North Lat. If God spares me, I will go farther north next year. I came to this part of my Diocese with the express purpose of locating three resident missionaries: two here, and one in Sitka, this very Autumn. I have every prospect of success, up to, and perhaps beyond my most sanguine wishes. But, to carry out my scheme, I shall have to draw on the clergy of the Island. I am anxiously expecting the two new priests from Louvain. I hope you will secure me some more courageous,

noble-hearted subjects, who would rather pluck out their eyes than indulge in grumbling. I desire to locate them in the Youcon Country. Communication with that region, which I visited in 1879, has become twice as easy since then."

Returning to Victoria, from a seven weeks' "trip" in Alaska, he again pleads with the Rector for additional missionaries. "Select and secure for me young men with the necessary qualities for the missions, especially courage to undertake and constancy to persevere." Soon after he asks for a candidate "sufficiently acquainted with the German, one who is determined to devote himself to poor missions, where, in his privations, he will have positively no other consolation and encouragement than the thought that what he does, nobody would do if he were not there." Early in 1886, the last year of his precious life, he is busy on the West coast of Vancouver Island. When he returned to Victoria he wrote to his friend, Rev. John De Leu, S. J., of Louvain :

"Do you know the disappointment and grief to which a missionary is exposed? Well, let me give you an idea. I left, February 15, on a small schooner to visit the western coast of this Island. It was a trip of six weeks ; the return voyage took place in an Indian canoe 15 feet long. Mind well, the waves of the Pacific Ocean are not like those you see near Ostend, but resemble those on the coast of France and Ireland. The man who had charge of my baggage forgot to put on the schooner the bag which contained my purple cassock, mitre, Pontifical, Breviary, wine and candles for Mass. Imagine my feelings when I arrived among the Indians and discovered the blunder! You know that the Indians greatly love pomp and ceremonies. Well, I did the best I could, blessed a new Church and confirmed thirty-six Indians, men and women. They were well instructed in our Holy Religion. Pray for their perseverance."

Though he had resigned all right and title to the Archbishopric of Oregon, Rome insisted that he still retain the title of Archbishop. "Last Sunday," he writes to the

Rector on June 4th, "I received, though unworthy, the Pallium from Archbishop Gross and the Bishops Junger, Brondel and Glorieux. I trust you will select one or two good missionaries from among your young men for this Diocese, some of the 'viri per quos salus facta est (or fiet) in Israel,' ready to shed their blood in Alaska!" What a deep meaning these last words contain! He soon was to set the noble example of a worthy leader in the cause of Christ. Had he a presentiment of his impending death.? On his way to martyrdom he wrote his last letter to the Rector:

"On board 'Steamer Ancon,' July 16, 1886, Lat. 57 N. Alaskan Waters. Dear Monseigneur: I am on my way to the interior of Alaska, with two Jesuit Fathers and one Brother to establish a permanent Mission away from the coast, where missionaries have not yet penetrated. I hope you will pray and make the students pray for my personal safety, for that of my companions, and for the success of my undertaking. I shall be absent probably a year or more. Be good enough to secure for my missions as many worthy young men as you can find. Yours truly in Jesus Christ, Charles John Seghers, Archbishop, Bishop of Vancouver Island."

Thus ends the Louvain correspondence. We trust an English biography of the sainted Archbishop will soon be written by some American Prelate or Priest, and that these letters will furnish serviceable matter.

WILLIAM STANG.

American College, Louvain

THE PARISH PRIEST AS A FINANCIER.

DR. TALBOT SMITH, in his lately published volume on Seminary-training, has a chapter entitled "Care of Church-Property." He justly censures not only "the money-grabbing spirit which so often takes possession of the priest," but the presumption of the untutored cleric who undertakes the task of "building churches and schools, of decorating and ornamenting, adding to the church-property, and continually improving—for the mere love of material things." Those who are not under the harrassing necessity (self-imposed or otherwise) of raising large amounts of money for the purpose of liquidating church debts, must feel that the proportion of priests who take on the spirit and habits of clerical mendicants is growing daily, especially in the more populous districts of Catholic activity.

Of course we need buildings, and the money to pay for them must be gotten somehow. It is also true that the priests who are commissioned to build churches are, as a rule, chosen from among the most zealous workers of the clerical body; that is to say, they are men who have been noted for their readiness to labor in the pulpit, the confessional, the homes of the sick and poor. Nevertheless, it does not require a very keen realization of facts or a very wide experience to learn—what the builders themselves of churches will occasionally confess—that the apostolic work which provides for the spiritual edifice of the Church must here and there suffer from the pressing obligation imposed by the temporal affair of collecting funds. This latter obligation encroaches on the higher domain in various ways. It has its influence, not only on the amount of real work done for souls, but, also, on its character. It shortens the sermons in favor of the "announcements," and lengthens the hymns during which the beadle goes round with the basket. It modifies and mutilates the ritual, in order to allow the celebrant to "take up the collection." It gives importance to the monthly quest by the priest, who to go through the aisles of the church dons the surplice, though he dispenses

with the sacred garment in the administration of some of the sacraments as custom permits. It makes the "father" sit or stand at the door of the church to remind the parishioners of the sixth precept, whilst the inconvenience of carrying out certain ceremonies of solemn baptism will justify his curtailing the sacramental rite in the sacristy. In short, it lessens the dignity of many solemn acts by making prominent the desire, because of the need, of money. More than this. Amid this quest for money theology often loses its vitality, and becomes a mere stenciled formalism to be used at the dictates of convenience. Thus the ancient standard of morality lets go its hold on the conscience. Amusements and occupations which bear their danger, and sometimes their unlawfulness, on their face are tolerated or urged after they have received the varnish and varied labels of "church festivals" or "for the benefit of the church," and people who may not "swear by the temple" are invited "to swear by the gold of the temple." Then there are Catholics who, otherwise disposed to do their duty, grow weary of the everlasting details about the disappointment of "last Sunday's collection," and feel a sickening repugnance to go to the parochial mass where one part of the congregation is berated for their penury and others have their vanity and purse-pride stimulated by the public reading of their names. In this systematic way virtue and love for religion diminishes in the fold, and it may be doubted whether even the material prosperity of the church is secured. There are undoubtedly many successful pastors in every large diocese who are rarely, if ever, heard to speak of money from the altar, and who have, nevertheless, raised proportionately larger amounts for church building and charitable work than others who, having large congregations, are never free from debt. "The less noise," justly observes Fr. Smith, "a priest makes in his parish about money the better for him and religion. The priest forever shouting expenses from the altar, and denouncing the stingy and indifferent, is financially a failure and spiritually a real harm to his people. The true priest and successful manager forms his plans carefully, quietly

describes them to his people, and then as quietly puts them into execution. He has no more to say until be makes his reports of results, and thanks the contributors for their aid."[1]

It is said, and with truth, that in order to obtain the requisite funds for church purposes, the people must be taught to give generously and frequently; that the habit of charity, like any other habit, may be cultivated; that many, especially immigrants, from countries where the church is endowed by the government or through religious foundations, do not realize the necessity of contributing; and that others are not disposed to give unless morally compelled by direct appeals to their sense either of human respect or of pleasure.

All this may embody sound reasons for making efforts to teach our people that they should support the Church and do so generously, but it does not prove that the methods which make of the priest a mere collector of funds and which have brought money to be in many places the common topic of the pulpit, are either the most effective or the proper means to bring about the virtue of generosity. No doubt there are times and occasions when extraordinary needs justify unusual modes of appeal for money. With such exceptional phases we are not concerned. We speak of the normal money-talks from the sacred chair or the altar, the collections perpetually pursuing the faithful in the Church, in the house, in business, on excursions or in fairs, through letters, tickets, collectors with all sorts of pleas, until religion becomes a burden rather than a consolation even to the well disposed.

Perhaps our contention will be better understood when we point out what appear to us to be the main reasons of the unwholesome fact that money forms so prominent a topic of speech in those very places where it should be of all others most discredited, as the abode and school of Him who made poverty the first condition of blessedness, and stigmatized

1 Our Seminaries, l. c pag. 242,

the quest after money as a bar to the Kingdom of Heaven. As these reasons are directly suggestive of the remedies for the evil of which we venture to speak here, we state the two together.

The first is the reckless mania for building grand edifices often out of all proportion to the needs and the means of the congregation whose place of worship they are meant to be. Beautiful churches are indeed most suitable expression of reverence and devotion toward the Divine Host who makes His Tabernacle with man. But when they are built from the forced contributions of people who find their faith growing cold because they are never reminded of it without the accompaniment of envelopes and basket and tickets amid ill-tempered harangues upon money, as if it were the one thing necessary, then it would seem we better were without the magnificent temples which may turn into our reproach. If they furnish monuments of priestly activity they may also furnish criticism upon the folly of the man who built without reckoning the cost or measuring the need of his congregation. What we require most of all is, not monuments, but numerous and small churches in which the pastors can overlook their flocks and feed without overburdening the individual members.

Kindred to this is the enforcing of methods by which a reasonable economy is secured in the construction of churches and parish buildings generally. The young priest who is sent out to build up a parish may be a saint, a theologian, a most popular advocate of a good cause, in short possessed of all the capabilities of successful administration. But he has had no experience, and he may not even suspect that he has anything to learn from the practical business man or the laborer who listens reverently to him on Sundays and consults him in regard to his own private affairs. Time will teach him, no doubt, if previous habits have not done so, to manage his parish-resources, but as Fr. Smith pertinently puts it, "most young priests have an idea that the money comes in anyway, no matter how little thought is devoted to it. . . . They fancy that a direct

appeal to the Congregation will always bring in the cash, without considering that the people may have reached the limit for that year."

We have indeed laws and methods for executive guidance laid down in the Acts and Decrees of the Baltimore Council, but they remain largely inoperative through the lack in many places of a regular and thorough system of Episcopal visitation, or the absence of local and efficient Deans. Thus it happens, to quote once more from "Our Seminaries" that "irresponsible priests, young and old, with no check but the distant bishop, no advisers except the courtiers of the parish, no knowledge but what is born of conceit, often plunge themselves and their parishes into enormous difficulties. Debts are bad enough, but they can be paid; monstrosities of churches and schools, hideous decoration, abominable taste in statues, altars, stations, ostensoriums, remain to curse the memory of those who fixed them for helpless decades on the tempers of the next generation. Bad book-keeping has entailed robust lawsuits on many parishes." And this leads us to a third remedy which might lessen financial jeremiades with which many parish churches are made to resound Sunday after Sunday.

A good method of book-keeping saves much useless expense. The Council of Baltimore ordains that in every parish house there should be kept (besides the registers of baptism, marriages, deaths, etc., showing the *status animarum*) an account book in which receipts and expenses are plainly and accurately noted; and the Council significantly adds that if through failure to comply with this law, *i. e.*, through the fault of the parish priest, the church sustains any loss, he is bound in conscience to make restitution. (Conc. Balt. III, 275.)

Apart from the law, the advantage of keeping written and orderly accounts is obvious. It prevents that universal tendency by which men, who easily earn and generously spend money, are led to purchase things which recommend themselves rather by their novelty than by their usefulness or necessity. It is well known that the Fathers are more read-

ily accessible to plausible agents of fakes than ordinary business people. For a similar reason unscrupulous dealers occasionally succeed in having the same bill presented and paid twice. Moreover, the habit of keeping accounts begets caution in the making of contracts, in the raising of necessary loans, and in those numerous business transactions with the outside world in which the priest who has charge of the temporal affairs of his parish must needs engage. The writer has before him Dr. Stang's recently published Pastoral Theology, in which is found a simple method of book-keeping for parish and diocesan purposes which would not puzzle a boy. What is mainly wanted is, of course, some definite impulse which makes every priest recognize the necessity of using these means for his own and his people's sake.

To sum up, therefore, our desultory sketch on the way to reduce the necessity of talking "money" in the pulpit to the extent in which it is actually done, we propose, first, that we build less expensive, perhaps smaller and more numerous churches, except where spontaneous generosity or other circumstances call for monumental edifices.

Secondly, that a method in the construction of church and parish buildings be enforced, by which the priest is prevented from investing half his collected money in purchasing experience before he comes to any satisfactory conclusion as to what he is about to do. A diocesan Board composed of tried priests and conscientious laymen acting as building inspectors would save much trouble, money and, at times, scandal.

Thirdly, that a course of book-keeping be given, and a thorough knowledge of it be demanded from the candidate for ordination. Furthermore, an experienced dean or confidential accountant should be considered as part of the official organism which carries out the decrees regarding episcopal visitation.

Finally, a firm conviction should be begotten in the young priest ere he enters upon a responsible mission, that the best way to get money for a good purpose from the people is to make them generous from conscious Christian principle. The generosity which arises from appeals to human weakness or

which is sentimental and constitutional is unreliable; it has its whims. But a generosity which rises out of Christian charity is boundless and unfailing, so long as you convince it of the reality of the divine promises. It is this sort of generosity which built the mediæval churches, and other institutions of Christian charity; and it will do the same to-day. The art of making people generous in this sense is no secret, and it is less troublesome than harassing them by collections or other contrivances to get money. It consists in preaching the word of God, well prepared and often; in catechizing the little ones so as to win their affection and obedience; in being a friend to the sick and needy; in proving one's zeal in the confessional; in frequent devotions made attractive and punctually attended. Then the priest need not hunt for money; it will come to him to fill all his necessities, and more, as many a true pastor of souls can witness, who have built beautiful churches and schools and parish houses without ever finding it necessary to make impatient demands for money from the pulpit.

THE PRESENTATION. (November 21st.)

And they brought the Ark of the Lord, and set it in its place in the midst of the tabernacle. (*II Kings* vi, 17.)

'T was fashioned fair of setim-wood;
Without, within, 't was purest gold;
Two golden Cherubim did brood
Above its Mercy-seat of old;
With bended knees and outstretched wings,
They went with Israel through weary wanderings.

The casket hid from common ken
Memorials of the King of kings:—
The covenant of God with men,
And twain of Israel's Sacred Things;
The Law, Jehovah's autograph!
The golden Manna-pot, and Aaron's budding staff.

And David danced, and the vast crowd
Of Israel's sons sang Victory,
And mingling with Hosannahs loud
Sounded the shawm and psaltery,
When the great Ark of Covenant
Came to Jerusalem, and to its royal tent.

But in the dread Captivity
'T was lost, nor never seen again:
No more the vested priest shall see
Thy Mercy-seat of God with men:
Nor morning psalm nor evening hymn
Shall greet the waiting ear of golden Cherubim.

II.

No more?—O God of Israel,
Thy Mercy-seat shall come again!
But Oh! no clashing cymbals tell
The mystic tale to ears of men:
SHE comes, true Ark of Covenant,
Unto the Temple, now become her Tenement!

SHE comes, the Kingly Mercy-seat
That shall be unto all the earth!
SHE comes, the Staff that shall repeat,
In the MESSIAS' lowly birth,
The story old of Aaron's Rod:—
'T will bud again—but now its Fruit shall be our GOD!

SHE comes, more blessed Manna-pot
That shall enclose the Bread of Heaven
Not gathered in some desert-spot
And to a single people given,—
But on the Cross of Calvary
Bringing Eternal Life to millions yet to be!

SHE comes! No twain of Cherubim
Fold Her with wings of burnished fire:
No myriad voices swell the hymn
To the faint cry of shawm and lyre:
The Ark of Covenant is here!—
And none but heavenly hosts divine the Mystery near!

L'ENVOI.

'T was lost, 't is found, O Israel!
But not thine old Palladium,
Guarding an earthly citadel!
The Night is passed, the Light is come:
For now the Day-star from above
Lighteth a Covenant no more of Fear, but LOVE!

H. T. HENRY.

Overbrook Seminary.

MISSAL OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S ABBEY, CANTERBURY.

SECOND PAPER.

HAVING made an attempt, in a former number of this REVIEW (September, 1896), to give a descriptive and picturesque account of the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, we are free to make a similar effort to indicate some of the more important phases of thought which Mr. Rule passed, and to recall some salient features in the arguments which appealed most forcibly to his intelligence, before he reached and in consequence of which he reached, the goal where argument in favor of his several theses regarding the document resolved itself into certitude. This course will take us into critical regions. But we shall not attempt to do more than offer some isolated examples of certain independent steps or stages by which this assurance was attained; and this being done, we shall allow the reader to connect the various steps or stages, and to reach the conclusion at which Mr. Rule has arrived, with the help of the very full and complete Introduction prefixed to the Missal.

I.—Perhaps, the first mental attitude with which a genuine scholar would approach the study of such a document as that which eventually established its claim to the title of The Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, is that of self-effacement. He would empty himself of all that he knows, or thinks himself to know, of the general history of the Roman Sacramentary. Indeed, he would forget everything and imagine nothing. His business would be to assure himself, in the first instance, of the facts, so to say, of the manuscript—the facts, whether they be estimated as indisputable, or problematical, or possible; and thus to master the document. Next, in order of time, one who was, or who aspired to prove himself to be, a liturgical discoverer, would mentally surround himself with the facts, as it were, of every other known missal of the Roman rite and type with which he was acquainted, or to which he could gain access. The liturgical adventurer, in the old sense of the word, would then be in possession of

two independent sets of phenomena in the science of liturgical investigation and criticism; and his third step would be to compare the known with the unknown, the common property of the world of letters with the individual "gift and grant" made to himself personally from the shelves of the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. In other words, a scholar intent on following to the blessed end an inspiration with which he had been favored, a student determined to lead to a logical conclusion the arguments which he himself had evolved from premises of which he entertained no doubts, would take two steps forward in his quest. He would first set to work to collate the verbal text of the document under his eye and hand with the verbal text of cognate and similar codices; and secondly, he would compare, contrast and balance one text against another text, or one against several, or one against all the rest. And the course he adopted towards the verbal text he would take also with the constituent and the structural texts. He would test and try them upon grammatical or literary grounds, by critical canons of style and manner and taste, upon historical and liturgical principles, and in any other way which ingenuity might suggest. This is a facile sentence to write with a few strokes of the pen from the reviewer's chair. In reality, the ideal thus depicted gave scholarly labor and laborious thought to the student for several years. But the thought and the scholarship produced both a result and a reward.

The reader may here be reminded of certain commonplaces, which need only to be stated to secure acceptance. First: He has been warned that the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey is a product of many dates and various sources of origin. He will not need to be warned that the printed Roman Missal of to-day—and the like is true of the written Roman Missal of the past—in two portions of its variable elements, comprises two principal parts; the Proper of the Season and the Proper of the Saints. In one or other of these divisions Holy Mass is said according to the Roman rite from Advent to Advent, or from the vigil of St. Andrew in one

year to the 27th, or 28th of November in another. It is in these two Propria of the Missal of St. Augustine's that the questions of textual criticisms will be raised. Secondly: The reader needs not to be reminded that the questions of various texts and different readings, of their greater or less purity, of authority in their favor, or of opinion against them, form an important element in the study of the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church, of the only not inspired Shakespeare or Dante or the author of the Imitation, and even of pagan writers. Perhaps, however, it may not be impertinent to inform him that like tests have been widely resorted to in the science of liturgiology: certainly, they have been copiously and carefully applied by Mr. Rule to the codex under consideration. Now, the application of critical formula to certain portions of the manuscript which lay before the editor suggested curious and noteworthy inferences, some of which may here be placed on record. The outcome of a collation of the newly discovered and hitherto in-edited Missal, in its last manuscript form, with the already well-known and well-edited Roman missal in their printed forms, in one direction and in regard to the text of the Proper of the Season was this. Whether a given variant in the Sant-augustinian Missal was supported (1) by many, or (2) by few, or (3) by none of the already published texts, whenever the Mass in which the new reading occurred was that of a Sunday, feast, or feria, which is known to have been liturgically celebrated at Rome in the year of St. Gregory's mission to England, then the reading in Mr. Rule's Missal was evidently and on critical grounds a good reading, as against a bad one elsewhere; or, it was a better reading in the first named, as against a worse in the others. But, on the other hand, whenever a variant—whether supported or unsupported by printed manuscripts of earlier date—was either intrinsically bad, or only inferior to the existing and rival reading, then the Mass in which it occurred was found to be a Mass for a day for which St. Gregory the Great is known to have made no liturgical provision—for instance, for a Thursday in Lent. But, this is not all to which we desire to draw atten-

tion in this place, of the textual results of Mr. Rule's prolonged study of the Santaugustinian codex. He also discovered a subsidiary, but a very nice and subtle distinction in the text of his own specially criticised manuscript. In several cases there existed this peculiarity: the same prayer appeared twice in different Masses; in a certain place with a good reading, in a certain other place with a bad reading: and further inquiry disclosed the very contrast which was detected previously, namely, that the bad reading belonged to a Mass of post-Gregorian origin, whilst the good reading was enshrined in the Mass for a day which, without doubt, was liturgically recognized by St. Gregory.

Important inferences may be deduced from Mr. Rule's discoveries. Before, however, they be enumerated, it may be convenient to anticipate tentatively not Mr. Rule's argument, but some of the results at which he claims to have arrived, and which he appears to have substantiated. This course will not prejudice the case for or against his discovery: it will tend only to an appreciation of it. Bearing in mind the unquestionable and unquestioned fact that the Corpus Manuscript is a composite document comprising Masses of varied date and different authorship, it is clear that, whilst its later portions may have been copied from no earlier codex, its more primitive parts must have been derived, mediately or immediately from some supremely early manuscript. In a case like the present, no working hypothesis would be either safe or feasible which did not assume a pedigree of at least two steps in the case of the primitive as distinguished from the adventitious portions of the Missal. Hence, the theoretical "prototype" and the theoretical "exemplar" of Mr. Rule's argument. The prototype is the earliest possible ancestor of the Gregorian portions of the Corpus Missal; the exemplar is their immediate parent. The former, for reasons which the reader will find stated in the introduction (pp. cvj–cviij), must certainly have left Rome before the institution of the new feast of St. Michael, which took place not later than the year 624, though it may have occurred as early as A. D. 606: in all probability it left Rome before the year 598.

The latter, the exemplar, is the particular and individual book whence the scribe of the Corpus Missal took his Gregorian Masses. And this particular book, for reasons which Mr. Rule holds, on grounds of a stichometrical character, to be sound reasons (pp. cviij–cxv), was written in uncial characters, and with only such contractions as were usual in the time of St. Gregory. It is therefore possible that the prototype and the exemplar were one and the same document; but, until it becomes evident that they were one and the same document, it is absolutely necessary to keep them scrupulously apart in the order of thought. This Mr. Rule does until they seem at last to merge into each other, like the two halves of a stereoscopic slide. It is not until the identity of the exemplar with the prototype has been practically ascertained that Mr. Rule pushes his contention a stage further, and claims to prove that "as regards its Masses of Gregorian cognizance, the Corpus manuscript is not merely a derivative of one of the missals brought to England by St. Augustine and his monks, in the year 597, but a direct and immediate transcript from St. Gregory's own 'working-copy' of his Sacramentary."

These explanatory reminders will help us to realize more clearly the gist and purport of the following inferences drawn by Mr. Rule at an early stage of his study of the Missal of St. Augustine's:

I.—That the Masses of the Cambridge manuscript, which bear the impress of Gregorian authorship and date, might have found their way into the document by a short descent from an authentic original. Or,

II.—That if the descent was not a short one, there existed, even at an almost primitive date, a standard liturgical reference, to which to attribute the manifest excellence and purity of the verbal text of the same document. But, on the other hand,

III.—That, in regard to the Masses which may be either safely relegated to a non-Gregorian source, or which historically could not have been produced at St. Gregory's date and by his authorship—their verbal text, from a critical

standpoint being a bad one—such Masses could not fairly be supposed to have come directly from Rome to the monastery of St. Augustine. And

IV.—That, in any case, no attempt would seem to have been made to achieve consistency of verbal text between Masses of an earlier and Masses of a later date and authorship, respectively, than those of the great Pontiff.

These four inferences, which must not as yet be taken as absolute conclusions, may be mentally noted and placed at the back of the memory, whilst another stage of the inquiry is traversed. Their purport cannot be fully appreciated until the argument is concluded.

This fresh stage in the liturgical journey is concerned with what at first sight seems to be an extremely slight peculiarity hardly deserving serious consideration. But, as it is with the keen intelligence of a trained expert in any other department of human thought, who is on the track of a discovery, so is the case with the explorer of unknown liturgical lands. He allows no evidence, however minute or inconspicuous, to escape an entry into his skeleton map of the new region he is traveling. Now, to the non-liturgical mind, there can perhaps be observed no more insignificant and objectless sign, or mark, in the story of a sacramentary, than the mere headings of its various prayers, or other devotional constituents. Yet, the expert can detect indications of date if not of authorship, of descent if not of source, even in these. And the Corpus codex possesses this peculiarity which it does not share with many, perhaps does not share with any other manuscript of high value, or of equally early date: the titles of certain of the constituent parts of the text display notable divergencies from each other in two directions. These peculiarities are exhibited in the Masses proper to Saints' days. Ordinarily, of course, the title of the several Masses would be grammatically framed in the genitive case, whether the governing formula, "In the Feast of" were expressed or implied. But, in the Missal of St. Augustine's

Abbey, whilst the large majority of Masses bear a genitive-case title, a substantive minority of them are preceded by an ablative-case title. What may this peculiarity signify? An explanation may be essayed from Mr. Rule's investigations. That, of two Masses concurring on a given day, the subordinate Mass should bear an ablative-case superscription is intelligible enough. But, for other than cases of concurrence, such a law is obviously inoperative. Mr. Rule has carefully collected these cases, has tabulated them, has pondered the apparent anomaly, and has formulated a theory from them which, if not absolutely certain, meets the requirements of the position, and in its underlying facts constitutes a powerful argument in favor of the theory to which he is pledged. Cases of concurrence apart, he declares it to be morally clear that, with but a single exception, none of the Masses which are, or which can have been, as early in date as St. Gregory's pontificate, are designated by ablative-case titles. The solitary exception, which will be considered further on, is found in the Mass for the feast of St. Cecilia's day. Provided only that a satisfactory solution can be found for this one exceptional employment of the ablative-case title, a deduction in positive terms commended itself to the liturgical instinct of the Editor from the negative position. It amounts to this: that the genitive titulations of the Masses proper to Saints' days are consistent with the theory that the Gregorian Masses, and they only, of the Corpus codex had been derived from a document marked with the consistency which would be antecedently predicated of an authentic and authoritative manuscript. And, to be quite plain, it may be added, that this deduction points towards the end finally reached by Mr. Rule, viz: that the original manuscript came from the official scriptorium of the Roman See in the days of St. Gregory the Great—perhaps came from the Saint's own hand. This conclusion, again, together with the former, may be noted, and placed at the back of the mind for future use.

The exceptional use of an ablative-case title prefixed to a Mass of a feast older than the age of St. Gregory, has now to be grappled with. At first sight, the problem *De Sancta*

Cecilia appears to an average liturgiologist to be involved and puzzling: but, it has been met and overcome by the instinct and foresight which marks the expert, whether in his own science of liturgies, or in the cognate lines of history and archaeology. Mr. Rule had better be allowed to speak, substantially, in his own words, here and there intercollated with explanatory words not his own, yet preserving the direct personal form of recitation. These inferences, he says, being pigeon-holed, "I turned my attention from the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, at Canterbury, to the tomb of St. Cecilia in the catacomb of St. Calixtus in Rome." From historical and archaeological facts and hints, and from suggestions and arguments based on both, which may easily be pretermitted in this place, it is fairly demonstrable that the tomb of St. Cecilia has been hidden from the sight of Christian Rome for a long and immemorial period, which terminated in the year 821. In connection with this two-fold condition of St. Cecilia's tomb, known and unknown, frequented or forgotten, two facts in Catholic liturgiology and hagiography, which certainly held good at the centre of Christendom, and perhaps obtained at its limits, deserve attention. They may thus be stated:

First.—Only a very small proportion of the martys of the Roman Church were, or indeed,—such was their number and such were the circumstances of the infant Church—could have been honored year by year with a public and solemn ecclesiastical commemoration or festum. In this connection it is obvious to remark, that there were four degrees of memorial conceded to the faithful departed by the Church of the early ages in Rome: 1. a small and inmost circle comprised those saints, the anniversary of whose death was kept with public and solemn liturgical honor by the whole Christian population. 2. Around this innermost circle was traced a wider space to include the Christian martyrs before whose tombs lamps were kept perpetually burning. 3. A still larger inclosure surrounded the second circle; and this included the whole residue, the whole noble army of martyrs being Roman. Whilst 4. The last all-embracing remem-

brance of Mother Church in her office, including all the holy dead who were laid at rest within the catacombs. Of these four concentric circles, whilst the occupants of the last were innumerable, or certainly were unnumbered, the first division was kept rigidly small—there may have been as many as thirty liturgical festa, there cannot have been forty, at the date of St. Gregory's pontificate: but in pre-Gregorian days, the feast of the martyred Saint, Cecilia, had been one out of the thirty or forty.

Secondly.—The other fact which demands attention has reference to the place in which the annual memorial of a martyr was wont to be made. Catholic hagiology tells us that the proper scene of these annual celebrations was the tomb itself of the blesssed martyrs. It seems, indeed, to have been of the essence of a Roman festum that the actual shrine of the Saint should form the central point of the solemnity. The law held good: "no recognized and approachable tomb; no ecclesiastical and popular festival." But on the other hand, given the tomb of a martyr and authority to celebrate his or her memorial, and on the day allotted to the commemoration, the whole of Christian Rome made holyday and holiday at the saint's last earthly resting-place. A popular festum ensued. These liturgical and hagiographical facts, taken in connection with the historic certitude that the festival of St. Cecilia, 1. was duly celebrated at a certain early date, in a certain given locality, and 2. was celebrated not at all, at a certain later, but still early date—"I was soon in possession," says Mr. Rule, "of a working hypothesis which it seemed worth while to test." This theorem may be quoted seriatim: a. That in the catacomb of St. Calixtus, the approaches to the tomb of St. Cecilia, at which festa were formerly held, had been blocked up before the mission of St. Augustine left Rome. b. That the political occasion of the obstruction was to be found in the apprehended siege of Rome by the Lombards, in A. D. 595. c. That the celebration of the Saint's festum was therefore and thenceforth for some generations intermitted. d. That, the necessity for abstention having passed away and

the notice of authority having been redirected to the Saint's tomb, the festum was restored to use in or about the year 821. e. That the monks of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, became possessed of their Mass for St. Cecilia's day, from whatever source it reached their hands, at a somewhat later date than the year 821. But, f. That prior to that date the feast had not been observed in the Abbey of St. Augustine's. g. Lastly, since St. Gregory's missionaries brought with them to Britain their liturgical formularies, the manuscripts they brought were missals which had been compiled, or if not compiled, had been revised in the pontifical scriptorium, after the suspension of the festival of St. Cecilia. An examition of the Itineraries and other kindred documents by Mr. Rule evoked evidence more than enough to justify and confirm this working theory, both by direct statement and by undesigned coincidence, though the exigencies of space prevent the repetition of such evidence here. "It was, I could perceive," he adds, "morally certain that the tomb of St. Cecilia had already been hidden from sight, and, consequently, that the festum had been actually discontinued in Rome, previously at least to the middle of the seventh century; and I was content to wait patiently for fresh light to break upon a difficult and obscure subject." In other words, Mr. Rule's theory that the festum of St. Cecilia had been discontinued in the year 595 was so far justified, as that he could marshal documentary evidence in proof that the discontinuance had begun, certainly, before A. D. 650.

Having considered the text of the Proper of the Season, Mr. Rule next directed his attention to the Rubrics of the same part of the Corpus Codex, that is to say, to the verbal headings of its various Masses; for, of distinctive rubrics there are, as we have said, but very few. Here some curious and interesting discoveries are in store for the explorer, whether or not the critic can follow him sympathetically. The inferences deduced from a careful and laborious examination of all the palmary cases selected, may thus be summarized from the Editor's Introduction to the volume. They are

threefold; and the reader will not fail to observe the conditional and modest form in which they are tentatively expressed. The first inference is thus stated: the Cambridge manuscript might have been copied from two or more documents, one of which contained none but Masses of St. Gregory's selection. The second inference expresses the opinion, that the Masses of St. Gregory's selection might have been copied into the Cambridge manuscript from a book arranged just as St. Gregory had arranged his own copies of the sacramentary. And the last affirms, that this exemplar might have been one of the books which the Pope's missionaries brought from Rome to Canterbury. These inferences are based, partly upon literary criticisms of the text of the Missal of St. Augustine's, and of those of the already printed sacramentaries which are acknowledged by scholars to be of Gregorian origin; and partly upon stichometrical evidence which now, for the first time, enters into the argument of Mr. Rule.

That gentleman, in his labor for the Rolls Office, upon one of the works of Eadmer, had become possessed of manuscript materials upon which he had based a monograph concerning the bibliographical methods of St. Anselm's disciple and biographer. In the production of that monograph, traveling by stichometrical paths, and following stichometrical clues, Mr. Rule had lighted upon a satisfactory explanation of an otherwise insoluble difficulty.[1] He now desired to see what stichometry could do for him in a different subject. Certain marginal memoranda written upon two folios of his treasured manuscript (folios 9, v and 10) seemed at a glance, to afford a point of departure. First impressions proved to be right; and were confirmed by further inspection. The written memoranda afforded a basis of operation. With a mental eye trained in the reading of manuscripts, and with a critical mind educated to perceive liturgical cause and effect where other intelligence would see neither, Mr. Rule was not long

1 Transactions of the Cambridge (England) Antiquarian Society for 1885–86, p. 252

before he realized, first, the aspect of a leaf of the book whence the scribe had copied at least his Gregorian Masses; and, secondly, the amount of attention, or of inattention with which the scribe performed his allotted, clerk-like task. For, in effect says Mr. Rule, the pages of the book, whence the scribe copied, were of small textual capacity; and the script was a script intolerant of contractions, save in the few words which it was customary to contract in St. Gregory's time. Moreover, he ventures to affirm, after a lapse of eight centuries, that the scribe was a careful workman; and yet, there were a few technical and merely technical inaccuracies, such as a nervous man, when interrupted in the steady pursuit of his work, might easily have committed. Mr. Rule next endeavored to translate back in terms of letters, or to "resolve" several pages of the Corpus Missal, in order to see what evidence that stichometrical process would yield in his search after indications of origin and descent, of primitive form and subsequent change. Till he came to the Mass for the Fourth Sunday in Advent, no difficulty was encountered: that is to say, down to this point in his "resolution" any one line of the contracted writing of the Cambridge codex resolved itself consistently into two lines of uncontracted writing, each line containing on an average 18 or 19 letters. Now, at the date at which the Corpus manuscript was written, the Mass in question possessed an antiphon; but, in the time of St. Gregory the Great, it, unlike most of the other Sunday Masses, had not yet been enriched with this liturgical introductory adjunct. Hence, in all reasonable certitude, the curious stichometrical anomaly, that, at the beginning of the Mass for the Fourth Sunday in Advent a line of the Corpus manuscript refused for the first time to resolve itself into two such lines as have been indicated. And lastly, Mr. Rule discovered that a page of the exemplar was of precisely the same literary capacity as the pages of St. Gregory's acknowledged sacramentary, when it reached the Pamelian Stage, *i. e.*, the stage in which the Mass for Christmas-Eve stood first in the book; and when, as yet, the great system of antiphons, or, as they

are now called, Introits, had not been introduced into the common order of the missal. The value and incidence of the last point will be more apparent, if it be remembered that Mr. Rule claims for each several family of sacramentaries a distinct character and place in the critical history of the text of the Mass. Of these two great families of missal texts, the Menardian and the Pamelian, the former may probably be considered to represent, in the readings in which it differs to minor details from the latter, an earlier recension of the work of the Pontiff; the last, the Pamelian, may be held to exhibit his maturer liturgical judgment, and was once thought to be the final expression of St. Gregory's opinion and judgment, as author or reviser. Thus, the various extant sacramentaries may be held to represent two distinct editions, if the modern term may be applied to the Papal recensions of the sixth century, of the Roman missals. How and by what process these various editions were created; how the variations were communicated to those whom it concerned; and in what way the old edition was practically replaced by the the new—these and many other liturgical questions are easy to ask and hard to answer. But, if we admit the reasonableness of the above suggestions, such an admission may help us to accept Mr. Rule's further contention, to the effect that to these two authorized editions of the missal, a successor is to be found in the Corpus Codex. To this bold expression of opinion Mr. Rule commits himself; and its boldness may be measured by the fact that the Congregation of Rites at Rome, albeit without cognizance of the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, based its authorized version on a comparison of the published texts reproduced in the works of Pamelius and Muratori.

One striking point in Mr. Rule's chapter entitled "Terminus ad quem of the Primitive Book," may here be mentioned. The Editor had remarked that several noteworthy details usually found in other missals were wanting in the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey—details which he would have expected to find had the parent, or the ultimate parent of the Corpus Missal left Rome, even as early as the year

599. But, as these were considerations of a negative character, he made no argumentative use of them. He felt himself on firmer ground, however, when he perceived that, in Corpus Codex, the Mass in honor of St. Michael the Archangel had been meant for use on September 30th—not on the 29th—and that the title was "In Veneratione, etc." Now it is doing Mr. Rule no more than justice to assume that a less acute and far-seeing critic might have overlooked this divergence of date with a mere casual and fugitive sentiment of regret at the carelessness of scribes and copyists. Not so Mr. Rule. He is delighted with the apparent oversight; feels there must be a cause, places aside the anomaly for future thought; makes fresh and further inquiries, and ultimately concludes with this inference, viz: That the exemplar from which the Cambridge manuscript was copied represented a state of things which existed in Rome prior to the institution of the dedication of the new Basilica of St. Michael—not the Feast of the Apparition, as it is now termed of the Archangel—on a certain 29th, not on the 30th day in the month of September, in some early year of the seventh century. This inference, taken in conjunction with several of the former inferences which have been named—especially to the effect that the Gregorian Masses had found their way into the Corpus Codex, either by a short descent from an authentic original, or have been introduced after a long lapse of time from some official standard of excellence; and also another, to the effect that the same codex had been copied from a book which contained none but Masses of Gregorian selection, and of Gregorian arrangement, left Mr. Rule without any reasonable doubt that the Corpus manuscript, as regards the Masses for Sundays and anniversaries, which were recognized by the Saint (always excepting the Mass for St. Cecilia's day), was a derivative from one of the Missals brought from Rome to Canterbury by the Santaugustinian missionaries themselves in the year of grace 597.

Mr. Rule next examined the verbal text of the Proper for Saints' days, as distinct from the constituent and structural

texts, in the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey. Excepting for the moment the Mass for St. Cecilia's day, on a careful and exhaustive examination on critical, grammatical and literary grounds, he discovered almost, if not quite without qualification, that every indifferently good, and every indisputably bad reading in the Missal occurred in a post-Gregorian Mass of Roman origin. This recurrence of a contrast between Masses referable to the pen of a Saint—who, besides being theologian and liturgist, was, previously to both, a grammarian and man of letters—and Masses of post-Gregorian institution invested the inference deducible therefrom with moral, if not with absolute certainty. The case is simply this: Here are seven or eight Masses, each of which contains at least one intolerable, or, at the best, one questionable reading. These Masses were compiled in Rome; they were compiled by people who knew the Latin language. How then shall we account for the faults that disfigure them? On the other hand, excepting, as before, the "De Sancta Cecilia," no such blemishes occur in Masses of Gregorian cognizance, and three questions consequently arise: 1. How came the earlier group to escape these grammatical blemishes? 2. How came the later group to contract them? And 3. What is the date of the first Mass that we find thus disfigured? Now, the first of these questions is met by referring the pure Latinity of the verbal text of the Gregorian Masses to a brief descent to such a book as the Monk Augustine would have brought to England. The second is met by supposing the post-Gregorian Masses of corrupted text to have come from Rome to England by a protracted journey of several scribal stages. And, however, all this may be, the answer to the third question is beyond dispute. The oldest Mass, with a corrupted verbal text, is a Mass which came into existence at Rome within a generation after the departure for Britain of St. Gregory's missionaries. These considerations bring us face to face, with the Mass for St. Cecilia's Day. In this Mass Mr. Rule finds a piece of unpardonably bad Latin; and this peculiarity serves to confirm his conviction that the Mass of St. Cecilia's day cannot have formed part of

the Missal brought to Canterbury in the year 597. In all reasonable probability, the Mass which now figures in the Corpus manuscript, had been adopted at Canterbury subsequently to and in consequence of the discovery of the Saint's body at Rome, on the reopening of her cubiculum, A. D. 821.

An important question now presented itself to the Editor of the Missal. It may be premised that, of the printed edition of the earlier sacramentaries known to liturgical students of the present day, the two editions of which Ménard may be considered the representative, and the two which may be called after the name of Pamelius, are the four main aspirants to the claim of giving the true text of the liturgical labors of St. Gregory the Great. This assumption may appear arbitrary; but little is still known of the real history of the edition of D'Azevedo, and the Leofric missal in the main is identical with Ménard, and space is valuable. Hence, it has not been thought well to complicate the present inquiry with the theories of more than the above-named individual claimants. These two branches of the Gregorian Sacramentaries are sufficient to conjure with; in all seriousness Mr. Rule does conjure with them; but he conjures not in play, but with a purpose. And these two branches we have ventured to call—on the understanding that we are dealing with the evidence only within the cognizance of scholars—the earlier and the later, or the first and second editions of the existing sacramentaries of St. Gregory, and that without presuming to judge between them as to purity to text. The Canterbury text must, in Mr. Rule's contention, be regarded as the embodiment of a third edition of the Saint's handiwork.

Now, upon a careful collation of the Ménardian and Palmenian texts, Mr. Rule was led to the conclusion that "much as these books differ from each other in structural order and arrangement, and much as they differ from each other as to the prayers which constitute their several Masses; whenever a prayer claiming to be Gregorian and assigned to some specific occasion is found in two or more of them[1] it is found,

1 The six texts above mentioned.

with a few rare and insignificant exceptions, under one and the same verbal form." If for a moment we let imagination take possession of us, and remember, at the least, the unknown dates and places of issue, the unknown editors and scribes of the copies, the unknown authors of the original portions of the manuscripts and the unknown history and treatment of these six liturgical units, or these two families in liturgical literature—the fact underlying Mr. Rule's statement is worthy of note. In any case, the venerable antiquity, the changeless uniformity, in all essentials and in many accidental elements, and the general textual purity of the Roman missal in common use, when tested by such a solvent, is almost beyond the power of estimation. For it is on these lines that the last revision of the current Latin Book of the Mass, known as the Pio-Clementine, is based. But here we chance upon an event of quite unique experience. In an overlooked manuscript in the College Library of a University in a missionary country that was once the Ultima Thule of the Roman patriarchate, and at the close of the nineteenth century is found another codex which is declared to be—with inevitable accretions, as before explained —a replica of St. Gregory's sacramentary. Identical in general characteristics, and in all important respects with the authorized Roman missal of to-day, it nevertheless exhibits differences, the claim of which to at least an academical notice by ecclesiastical authority is recommended by the remarkable fact that such of them as are susceptible of a literary test prove themselves capable of bearing that test. The readings peculiar to the Missal discovered by Mr. Rule may confidently be pronounced better readings in respect of theological accuracy and of linguistic purity than those hitherto familiar to scholars and divines. Nor is this all. The editor would seem, from his multitudinous quotations and references, to have made it abundantly clear that these peculiar readings bear a manifest family likeness, and in some cases an absolutely verbal correspondence and identity with the diction, the manner and even the mannerisms of Gregory the Great. We can but state, in the clearest terms

at our command, the learned and thoughtful inferences, cautiously if slowly reached by Mr. Rule, and leave the delivery of a verdict on them to liturgical experts. Those inferences may be thus formulated in a threefold order:

1.—That liturgical scholars will admit the verbal variants in the Corpus manuscript to be unquestionable improvements on the readings of other known texts—in so far as the Masses of Gregorian origination are concerned.

2.—That students who have made the commentaries, the sermons, or the ascetic works of St. Gregory their special study, will be struck with the resemblance which these improvements in textual readings bear to the Pontiff's literary style.

3.—That, from these data, an open-minded and unprejudiced conclusion will be reached, namely, that the English Editor is justified in believing the Corpus codex, so far as regards its Gregorian Masses, to represent a later textual revision (*i. e.* our so-called third edition) than that represented either by the Pamelian or by the Ménardian manuscripts, or even than by the authorized revision of the missal in the sixteenth century.

These three inferences may well be termed important. One amongst many good reasons for thus characterizing them may thus be given. They constitute a second and independent claim on behalf of the Corpus codex to the position which Mr. Rule assigns to it; a claim beyond and apart from the antiquarian claim already adumbrated, namely this—that the Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, in its Masses of Gregorian origination, embodies an authentic verbal recension of the sacramentary of Pope Gregory of a later date than that exhibited by any other existing text, a recension which was not so much as dreamt of by such liturgical giants as Alcuin, or Amalarius, or Walafrid Strabo or other early experts.

The seventh stage of progress, to which we propose to draw attention, is now reached. Returning to the subject of

the derivation and pedigree of the Corpus codex, the Editor next attacked the constituent text, as distinguished from the verbal and structural texts. In order to estimate aright the peculiarities of its constituent text, he compared the manuscript with the document which it most nearly resembled. That document was the Gregorian missal edited by Pamelius. During the process of comparison and contrast, Mr. Rule discovered a few places in which a prayer found in the Pamelian edition had been superseded by some other prayer in the Santaugustinian missal. But, besides these isolated instances of variation between the two documents, Mr. Rule found several groups or clusters of changes in other directions. To some of these changes especial attention is invited, as the investigation whether in facts elicited, or in inferences hazarded, or in results deduced, are very important factors in the proof of Mr. Rule's main contention.

The first cluster of changes that were noticed and examined lay distributed over the Advent and Christmas Masses. They were distributed in such a manner as to make it evident that, in order to allow them to appear in proper guise in any manuscript book, without disfiguring the document by want of uniformity, the first nine Masses must have been, from the initial to the last word, written over again. And this course must have been adopted, since, not only had new constituents taken the place of older constituents; but lengthy constituents had been substituted for those that were shorter; and two new prefaces had been inserted, where previously there had been none. The question then arose: were these changes made before or after the "publication" of the sacramentary? To answer this question, the Editor applied to both the Corpus manuscript, and to the printed edition of the Gregorian missal an elementary and crucial test yielded by stichometry. He made a careful estimate, in terms of letters, of the net addition in these changes in the Pamelian text, and included in the calculation of the aggregate of letters a parenthetical clause by which one of the prayers had been augmented. The result was both curious and decisive. The net increment had precisely the value of one leaf of the exemplar of

the Corpus codex, as well as of one leaf of that earlier edition of St. Gregory's sacramentary which is made known to us in the printed edition of Pamelius. In other words, so far as textual content is concerned, a page of the prototype of the Pamelian edition of St. Gregory's missal was the equivalent of a page of the prototype of the Canterbury missal.

The next step was from the examination of textual capacity as indicated stichometrically in relation to the variation of constituents, to a comparison of the two sacramentaries in regard to their structural text. Upon collating the manuscript and printed missals, Mr. Rule found, amongst other indications which pointed to the truth of his theory, two striking features. First, that, whereas, on January 20th, the Pamelian missal provides two Masses for the day, one for St. Fabian and another for St. Sebastian, the Corpus codex exhibits but one Mass for the two Saints, and that a composite one. And secondly, that, whereas on August 6th, the Pamelian missal again provides two Masses, one for St. Sixtus, and one for St. Felicissimus and St. Agapitus conjointly; the Corpus book has but one single Mass which does duty for all three Saints. Now, the reader will remember that Mr. Rule was already convinced that, in the catacombs of St. Calixtus, the cubiculum of St. Cecilia had been closed, and the neighboring passages and staircases earthed up, somewhere about A. D. 600. But, the discoverer of the Missal was not forgetful of the fact that, in closest proximity with the cubiculum was situated the Papal crypt which shared the same fate; and that in the Papal crypt reposed all that was mortal of the two saints and popes, Fabian and Sixtus II, whilst the liturgical principles previously stated applied equally to the Papal crypt and to the Saint's cubiculum. On making this fresh textual discovery, Mr. Rule reflected thus with himself: It has been made almost absolutely certain that the exemplar of the Corpus book contained no Mass for St. Cecilia's day; it is now equally clear that it possessed no separate Mass for SS. Fabian and Sixtus,

Popes who were buried in that part of the catacomb which next adjoined the burial place of St. Cecilia. This reflection led to the obvious inference which is probably beyond controversy, that the exemplar of the Corpus missal—or, if that book were a copy only, that the parent sacramentary—had left the Roman and Papal scriptorium after the closing of the Papal crypt and the cubiculum of St. Cecilia, at some date not far removed from A. D. 600.

The last stage, in our estimate of Mr. Rule's journey of discovery, is in many ways a notable one. At least it shows the discoverer in the light not only of an enterprising liturgical traveler, but of one who possesses a keen sense of observation and a judicious power of exercising it. Having reached the position described in the last two paragraphs, the Editor looked again and with renewed attention at his subject, and found that, besides the three peculiarities named above in regard to the Masses, 1, for St. Cecilia ; 2, for SS. Felicissimus and Sixtus, and 3, for St. Fabian, there were three other liturgical peculiarities in the Corpus codex, and that these six peculiarities, so to say, ran in pairs. Thus:

I.—In near neighborhood to the place in the exemplar missal where there might have stood, and where presumably there had stood, a Mass in honor of St. Cecilia, was a Mass which is not to be found in the Pamelian edition of the sacramentary of St. Gregory. This strange Mass is allotted to the octave day of the feast of the Apostle, St. Andrew. This was a very important find, the full value of which the reader will appreciate when he calls to mind what probably at first he may not remember, viz, that St. Augustine's monks were emphatically St. Andrew's men. For, did not St. Gregory the Great send forth his "Italian mission" to the British Isle from the travertine steps still visible of the Basilica of St. Andrew on the Coelian Hill in Rome? Following the clue of this surmise, the Editor estimated the space occupied by the new and inserted Mass for the Octave of St. Andrew; and to his infinite gratification found that

it was, to a letter, of the same textual value as the old and cancelled Mass for St. Cecilia's day. This discovery was worthy of the labor expended upon it.

II.—In the first case the reader will observe that in the Corpus codex there had occurred a simple exchange of one Mass for another which equaled, or was made to correspond with, in textual capacity, the former. In the second case a more complex and intricate course was adopted—that of partial omission from one Mass, and of partial combination of two Masses into a single composite whole. This was effected as follows: Quite close to the Mass for the three saints of August 6th, Sixtus and Felicissimus and Agapitus, quite close, that is to say, to the place at which the Mass for SS. Felicissimus and Agapitus had been canceled, some unknown but apparently authoritative editor or reviser had been at the pains to cancel in the exemplar of the Corpus book—or in some other book in its line of pedigree—not indeed one of the two Masses for St. Laurence, on August 10th, but two constituents of the two Masses for that Saint, and one constituent of the other Mass; to combine the residual constituents, and thus to create in the place of two, one hybrid Mass in honor of St. Laurence. Mr. Rule again appealed to his stichometrical principles, and acted upon them. He estimated the space which was thus freed from manuscript, counted the letters, and found that the aggregate value of these canceled constituents on St. Laurence's day, and of the canceled Mass of August 6th, allowance again being made for verbal modifications, all of which are evident, had the precise textual value of an average leaf of the missals—a value which, as previously ascertained, amounted to 740 letters.

III.—Mr. Rule then gave renewed attention to a fact which he had formerly remarked, namely, that in the Corpus codex the Mass for St. Fabian and St. Sebastian betrayed a character more eclectic than the Mass of St. Laurence, just described. In truth, it not only combined two Masses for a single saint, but two Masses for two different saints in unequal proportions. This compilation was effected by amalgamating two-thirds of

a Mass belonging of right to St. Sebastian, with one-third of a Mass belonging of right to St. Fabian. Moreover, Mr. Rule found that in proximity to the place which it had occupied in the exemplar, towards the end of the Proper of the Season, a Mass was found to be missing; and here the pairing process proved to have been an equally nice and minute piece of workmanship with those in the former cases. For, further examination disclosed the following noteworthy fact, that, when he took account of the number of letters in the canceled Mass at the end of the Proper of the Season, and in the canceled constituents—one from St. Sebastian and two from St. Fabian of January 20th—allowances, again, being made for necessary and existing verbal modifications, the aggregate amount of released text had the value, precisely, of an average prototypal leaf, namely, 740 letters.

From these data it became evident, (1) that the peculiarities of the constituent text proper to the Corpus codex had come into existence in Rome; (2) that they had come into existence as a consequence of the closing of the Papal vault and the cubiculum of St. Cecilia; and (3) that the book in which they were enshrined—a book which Mr. Rule calls St. Gregory's "working copy"—was one whose leaves had precisely the same textual capacity of the leaves of the prototype, and, indeed if it was not the self-same document, of the exemplar of the Corpus manuscript. The question then arose, could St. Gregory's working copy, and the exemplar which contained the Gregorian Masses of the Corpus codex have been one and the same document?

The final stage in Mr. Rule's prolonged, intricate and skillful argument, with its multitude of minute technical details, it is impossible to develop and elucidate in a condensed form, and in the space here at command. That, in regard to the Masses of Gregorian origination, the Corpus codex was transcribed directly from the working copy of St. Gregory the Great; and that, after transcription, it was carefully corrected to an exact conformity with an authorized standard of the Saint's text, in a fair and clean copy—this is Mr. Rule's contention, and this he claims, and so far as existing evidence

proves, justly claims to have established. Moreover, he holds that the working copy and the fair copy were both of them preserved in the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul, at Canterbury, when the Corpus manuscript was engrossed. For a full examination and statement of this final claim, the reader must refer to the Introduction to the Missal.

AN ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

EDIT. NOTE.—In an article on St. Gregory's Mass Book, which appears in the September number of *The Month* (London), Father Thurston, S.J., criticises the legitimacy and logical value of Mr. Rule's deductions, as set forth in the above paper; accordingly, he does not agree with the conclusions at which the Editor of the Canterbury Manuscript arrives. Mr. Rule has answer Father Thurston's strictures, in several letters to be found in the current issues of the (London) *Tablet*. Whatever judgment the reader may be inclined to form regarding the proofs intended to show the actual age of the Canterbury Missal of St. Augustine's Abbey, it is certain that Mr. Rule's discovery, and his labors illustrating the value of that discovery, are equally interesting and instructive for the student of liturgical science.

ANALECTA.

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE.

DILECTO FILIO SEBASTIANO MARTINELLI, PRIORI GENERALI EREMITARUM ORDINIS S. AUGUSTINI.

Dilecte Fili, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Apostolici muneris partes, quas, viribus licet imparibus, divina tamen virtute freti explere studemus, Nos saepe illius admonent sollicitudinis quam Romanum Pontificem ad procurandum Ecclesiarum omnium bonum pervigili cura impendere oportet ut in omnibus vel longo terrarum marisque tractu dissitis regionibus ea adimpleantur quas Catholico nomini aeternaeque fidelium saluti bene, prospere, felicique eveniant.

Jamvero cum gravibus de causis Foederatorum statuum Americae Septentrionalis Ecclesiae peculiares nostras curas provisionesque expostulent, et dilectus filius Noster S.R.E. Cardinalis Franciscus Satolli mandatum suum iisdem in Statibus ad quos, munere Delegati Apostolici insignitus a Nobis missus fuerat, expleverit, Nos attentis pietate, doctrina, religionis zelo, usu rerum, prudentia, consilio, aliisque praestantibus tui animi ingeniique laudibus, omnibus rei momentis mature perpensis cum Venerabilibus Fratribus Nostris S.R.E. Cardinalibus negotiis Propagandae Fidei praepositis de Fratrum eorumdem consilio, tibi, dilecte fili, Delegationem hujusmodi committendam existimavimus. Quare te quem per similes Nostras literas hoc ipso die datas titularis Ecclesiae Ephesinae archiepiscopum renuntiavimus, peculiari benevolentia complectentes et a quibusvis excommunicationis, suspensionis et interdicti aliisque ecclesiasticis sententiis, censuris et poenis, si quas forte incurreris, hujus tantum rei gratia absolventes, et absolutum fore censentes,

Apostolica Nostra auctoritate praesentium vi Delegatum Apostolicum in Foederatis Statibus Americae Septentrionalis ad Nostrum et hujus Sanctae Sedis beneplacitum eligimus, facimus, renuntiamus.

Tibi itaque concedimus omnes et singulas facultates necessarias et opportunas ad Delegationem hujusmodi gerendam, omnibusque et singulis ad quos pertinet praecipimus ut in te Apostolico Delegato supremam Delegantis Pontificis auctoritatem agnoscentes, in omnibus tibi, dilecte fili, faveant, praesto sint, ac pareant, tuaque salubria monita et mandata reverenter excipiant atque efficaciter adimpleant, secus sententiam quam rite in rebelles tuleris ratam habebimus, eamque faciemus auctorante Domino usque ad satisfactionem condignam inviolabiliter observari.

Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die xviii Augusti, MDCCCXCVI, Pontificatus Nostri anno decimonono.

C. *Card.* DE RUGGIERO.

E S. CONGREGATIONE CONCILII.

I.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS STIPENDS FOR MASSES.

In the current March issue of the REVIEW we discussed a Decree of the S. Congregation of the Council requiring that surplus stipends for Masses not said by the end of the year should be turned over to the Ordinary for distribution among the needy clergy of his diocese. As religious are included in the decree the question arose whether the Bishop of the Diocese in which they live, or the Superior of the Order is to be regarded by them as their Ordinary in the given case. The S. Congregation decides that the Superiors of the Orders are here to be understood to be the Ordinaries for religious.

DE SENSU VOCIS "ORDINARIO" IN DECRETO "VIGILANTI."

Cum Illmus Dominus Episcopus N. non eodem sensu, quo Fratres nostri Parochi, explicaret "Ordinario" Decreti *Vigilanti studio* S. C. C. 25 Maji 1893, res delata fuit ad eamdem S. Congregationem. Et Rmus Episcopus, responso Romano accepto, mense Januarii p. e. scripsit R. P. Ministro Provinciae N. ut sequitur:

"S. Congr. Conc.... haud improbandam censuit sententiam Procuratoris Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum et Ministri Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum et Ministeri Generalis Ordinis Minorum, nimirum Religiosos Parochos vi praefati Decreti teneri quidem rationem reddere de intentionibus Missarum Ordinario, sed Ordinario proprio, h. e. Superiori suo Regulari. Et id ad normam juris communis: quare nisi in aliqua regione, praesertim in locis Missionum, jus aliquod particulare in hac re vigeat: Regulares etiam Parochi, si Superiori respectivi Ordinis rationem reddant, non sunt inquietandi."

II.

THE "TAXA" FOR MARRIAGE DISPENSATIONS, ETC.

The S. Congregation lays down certain rules for fixing the rates of various classes of dispensations to be obtained from the Episcopal chanceries. The taxa is to be entirely remitted to the poor; and in all cases to be moderate, so as not to prevent Catholics from approaching freely the sacraments.

QUOAD TAXAS FORI ECCLESIASTICI IN REBUS NON CONTENTIOSIS.

(*Decretum.*)

Ut norma haberetur uniformis in exactionibus pro variis actibus jurisdictionis ecclesiasticae non contentiosae, ac immodicarum taxarum onus, pluriumque controversiarum occasio tolleretur, Innocentius PP. XI legem tulit, quae, Innocentiana vulgo appellata hujusmodi exactionum rationem apte moderabatur.

Sed cum haec lex italico idiomate esset exarata, et idcirco communiori Doctorum sententia eam nonnisi Italiae et adiacentium insularum dioeceses proprie afficere traderetur, ceteris autem congruentem dumtaxat agendi regulam praebere; haud universim videbatur consultum incommodis, quibus amovendis lex illa prodierat.

Praeterea post tria ferme saecula a legis promulgatione, pecuniae valore et aestimatione mutatis, et in novis diversisque adiunctis societate versante, plena Innocentianae legis observantia in ipsis Italiae dioecesibus difficilis evasit, et quandoque etiam incongrua: unde Ordinarii majori in dies numero postulare coeperunt, ut novae peculiaresque exactiones ab Innocentiana diversae, probarentur aut tolerarentur.

His mature perpensis, et per officium S. C. Concilli Archiepiscopis nedum Italiae sed et aliarum regionum de sententia rogatis, SSmus D. N. Leo PP. XIII particularem Commissionem penes S. Concilii Congregationem constituit, eique in mandatis dedit, ut de hac re cognosceret suamque sententiam emitteret.

Iamvero in conventibus semel atque iterum ab ea habitis, tria quae sequuntur dubia, quibus universa quaestio comprehendi visa est, ad examen revocata sunt, nimirum:

"I. An et quae taxae imponi possint juxta prudentiae et justitiae regulas in materia sacramentali, ac speciatim in matrimoniali, itemque in materia beneficiaria.

"II. An generalibus quibusdam editis normis, specifica praefinitio taxarum in singulis diocesibus Ordinariorum arbitrio sit relinquenda; an potius praescribendum, ut hac de re agatur in synodis provincialibus, et quatenus synodi haberi nequeant, in conventibus Episcoporum in singulis provinciis, et in Italia in singulis regionibus, ad hunc effectum peculiariter habendis, sub lege nempe ut uniformis taxa in singulis provinciis seu regionibus quoad fieri possit statuatur, Sacrae Concilii Congregationi pro approbatione subiicienda.

"III. An et quaenam aliae provisiones hac de re sint adhibendae."

Quibus Emi Patres praevio Consultorum voto respondendum censuerunt:

"Ad I. Affirmative, ita tamen ut quoad actus qui directe respiciunt sacramentorum administrationem servetur dispositio *cap. 42 Decret. De Simonia*, scilicet ut libere conferantur ecclesiastica sacramenta et piae consuetudines observentur.

"Quod vero ad reliquos actus, qui directe non respiciunt administrationem sacramentorum, uti sunt dispensatio a denunciationibus matrimonii, venia conferendi baptisma in privatis domibus, et cetera hujusmodi,

"1. servandas laudabiles consuetudines, et rationem prudenter habendam locorum, temporum ac personarum:

"2. vere pauperes eximendos a quibusvis expensis:

"3. taxas non adeo graves esse debere, ut arceant fideles a receptione sacramentorum:

"4. quoad matrimonium in specie, remittendas ipsas taxas esse in casibus in quibus adsit periculum, ne fideles in concubinatum proruant.

"5. tandem quoad beneficia ecclesiastica, taxas esse non debere proportionaliter inadaequatas reditibus beneficiorum.

"Ad II. Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

"Ad III. Affirmative, et taxarum descriptionem seu notulam, modo et normis superius expositis confectam, quamprimum transmittendam ad S. Concilii Congregationem pro approbatione; quae tantum concedenda erit ad instar experimenti, pro dioecesibus Europae ad quinquennium, pro reliquis vero ad decennium."

Facta exinde de his omnibus relatione SSmo Domino Nostro per infrascriptum S. C. Concilii Praefectum, Sanctitas Sua dignata est resolutionem Em. Patrum plene approbare et confirmare: simulque mandavit ut ab omnibus ad quos spectat sedulo atque integre servetur, contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex aedibus S. C. Concilii die 10 Junii 1896.

A. *Card.* DI PIETRO, *S. C., Concilii Praef.*

L. ✠ S. BENIAMINUS, *Archiep. Nazianzenus Pro-Secret.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

DE CONCURRENTIA OFFICIORUM.

Dubium.

Rmus Dnus Josephus A. Broquet, Vicarius generalis Dioeceseos Geneven., a Sacra Rituum Congregatione humillime postulavit sequentis dubii solutionem, nimirum:

Utrum, concurrentibus secundis Vesperis Officii votivi de B. Maria V. Immaculata cum primis Vesperis Dominicae sequentis, Vesperae fieri debeant a capitulo de Dominica, vel potius recitandi sint psalmi de sabbato?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, exquisito voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, atque re perpensa, rescribendum censuit:

Affirmative ad primam partem; negative ad secundam.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 3 Septembris 1895.

CAJ. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C., Praef.*

L. ✠ S. ALOISIUS TRIPEPI, *Secretarius.*

E COMMISSIONE PONTIFICIA

ad reconciliationem dissidentium cum ecclesia fovendam.

Cardinal Ledochowski, in the name of the Holy Father, answers certain questions proposed by the Armenian Patriarch for the government of the Catholics in the East where two distinct rites of consecration are practiced. The letter is dated February 14th, 1896, and while not directly affecting the legislation regarding Greek Catholics in this country, will be of interest to priests who minister to immigrants from Armenia. We give only that portion of the document which is legislative.

Sanctitas Sua, ut sequitur, resolvit:

I. Catholici Orientales in quorum ritu adhibetur fermentatum pro sacramentali communione (v. g. Melchitae, Syri, Chaldaei), si reperiantur in aliquo Orientis loco ubi adsunt

tantummodo Sacerdotes Latini et Orientales in azymo consecrantes (Armeni vel Maronitae), debent subjacere jurisdictioni parochi Orientalis in azymo consecrantis, non autem parochi Latini.

II. Quoties Orientales in quorum ritu adhibetur fermentatum, non habent parochum proprii ritus in aliquo Orientis loco, ubi adsunt tantummodo sacerdotes aliorum rituum Orientalium qui in azymo consecrant (Armeni et Maronitae) ipsis fas est amplectendi jurisdictionem quae magis arriserit; eo tamen pacto ut quum optaverint, non amplius mutare possint, quoadusque in eodem loco commorentur.

III. Catholici Orientales, quaequae sint species quibus utantur pro sacramentali communione, quoties proprii ritus parocho privantur in aliquo loco Orientis ubi adsunt sacerdotes ceterorum rituum, in azymo vel in fermentato consecrantes, possunt habitualiter, id est *devotionis gratia*, communionem suscipere nunc in azymo, nunc in fermentato, prout magis ipsis placuerit.

IV. Armenis dioecesis Melitenensis qui usque ad epocham promulgationis Const. Apost. *Orientalium dignitas Ecclesiarum* ritum latinum amplexi sunt, vel tantummodo eo usi sunt, omnino fas est, ut a S. Sede postulent facultatem redeundi ad ritum Armenum; sed ad hoc, neque tenentur, neque cogi possunt.

E S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

DECRETUM.

Ordinis Praedicatorum de erectione et aggregatione Confraternitatum.

Procurator Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum sequentia dubia huic S. Congregationi Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae humiliter dirimenda proposuit:

I. An conditio Clementinae Constitutionis "Quaecumque," de consensu Ordinarii loci et de litteris testimonialibus,

servanda in erectionibus et aggregationibus Confraternitatum accipienda sit ita, ut duo requirantur actus distincti, consensus nempe et litterae testimoniales: vel potius sufficiat consensus implicite expressus in litteris testimonialibus?

II. An Summarium Indulgentiarum quod una cum Diplomate datur in erectione et aggregatione Confraternitatum jam recognitum et approbatum a S. Congr. Indulg., nova etiam indigeat recognitione Ordinarii loci?

III. An distincta Communitas, quam Decretum S. C. Indulg. in una Lauden. diei 31 Januarii 1893 pro erectione Confraternitatum ejusdem nominis et instituti requirit, constituatur etiam a quolibet ejusdem municipii oppido situ et nomine ab aliis disjuncto, adeo ut in uno eodemque municipio plures ejusdem nominis et instituti Confraternitates erigi possint?

IV. An in magnis civitatibus, quae unam tantum constituunt Communitatem, plures nihilominus erigi possint ejusdem nominis et instituti Confraternitates?

V. An erectio Confraternitatum SSmi Rosarii facta per litteras Magistri Generalis Ord. Praed. facultativas, executioni mandatas a sacerdote sive regulari sive saeculari ab eodem Mag. Gen. deputato, valida sit si Ordinarius consensum quidem suum ante executionem exprimat, nullas vero litteras testimoniales concedat?

VI. An ipsae litterae facultativae validae sint si subscriptione et sigillo ejusdem Magistri Generalis munitae, aut certum sacerdotem ad executionem non deputent, aut locum Confraternitatis erigendae non exprimant?

Deinde sequentia postulata exhibuit:

I. (*a*) Quoad praeteritum: Ut omnes SSmi Rosarii Confraternitates quae sive in propriis Ordinis sive in aliis Orbis ecclesiis erectae inveniuntur irregularitate vel vitio nullitatis affectae ob quemcumque loci distantiae, litterarum testimonialium, diplomatum concessionis, sive alterius cujusque generis defectum in radice sanentur, et, quatenus opus sit, immediata Apostolica Auctoritate de novo erigantur, firmis remanentibus privilegiis a RR. PP. Ordini Praed. elargitis.

(*b*) Quoad futurum: Ad majus incrementum Sodalitatum SSmi Rosarii postulat facultatem pro Magistro Generali Ord. Praedic. ejusque Vicario, ut penes Provinciales et Episcopos, etiam in Europa, non tamen in Italia, possit eo modo, quo de consensu a S. Sede habito agere solent aliorum Ordinum Superiores, et ipse agit extra Europam, diplomata in deposito habere, servatis tamen iisdem ordinationibus et conditionibus ab ipsis RR. PP. datis.

II. Ut in magnis civitatibus ubi habitantium numerus centum excedit millia, tres vel quatour etiam Confraternitates SSmi Rosarii de speciali Sanctae Sedis mandato erigi possint et valeant.

III. Ut duo postrema postulata extendantur etiam ad alias duas Confraternitates SSmi Nominis Dei, necnon Militiae Angelicae S. Thomae Aquinatis.

Et Emi ac Rmi Patres Cardinales in generalibus Comitiis ad Vaticanas Aedes habitis die 5 Martii 1896 rescripserunt:

Ad Dubium I. *Sufficere Ordinarii litteras, quibus consensum in eretionem vel aggregationem Confraternitatum significet et instituti pietatem ac religionem commendet.*

Ad II. *Negative.*

Ad III. *Affirmative, dummodo in unoquoque oppido habeatur etiam propria paroecia.*

Ad IV. *Negative, sed supplicandum SSmo ut derogando in hac parte Constitutioni s. m. Clementis VIII quae incipit* "Quaecumque," *Ordinariis benigne tribuere dignetur facultatem providendi pro eorum arbitrio et prudentia in singulis casibus, servata tamen in hujusmodi erectionibus convenienti, eorum judicio, distantia.*

Ad V. *Negative.*

Ad VI. *Negative.*

Ad postulata vero:

Quoad I. (*a*) *Affirmative.*

Quoad I. (*b*) *Non expedire.*

Quoad II. *Jam satis provisum in responsione ad dubium IV.*

Quoad III. *Jam provisum in responsione ad duo postulata priora.*

Factaque de iis omnibus SSmo Domino Nostro Leoni PP. XIII relatione in Audientia habita die 20 Maii 1896 ab infrascripto Cardinali S. Congregations Praefecto, Sanctitas Sua resolutiones Emorum Patrum ratas habuit et confirmavit, simulque, derogando Constitutioni Clementis VIII, facultatem in IV dubio postulatam benigne Ordinariis concedere dignatus est.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 20 Maii 1896.

ANDREAS *Card.* STEINHUBER, *Praef.*

L. ✠ S. ALEXANDER ARCHIEP. NICOPOL., *Secretarius.*

CONFERENCES.

THE RIGHT OF REFUSING ABSOLUTION, ACCORDING TO THE BALTIMORE COUNCIL.

Qu. I. Do the Roman Instruction of November 24, 1875, and the Decrees of the Third Plenary Council justify a priest in making the following declaration to his people, even *consensu Ordinarii:* "Hereafter I shall refuse absolution to parents who send their children to the public schools, unless such parents have obtained the permission of the Bishop to do so."

II. Can the words of the Roman Instruction "*in casu aliquo particulari,*" etc., be interpreted to mean that in every single case the Bishop's judgment is to be sought?

III. In order to *refuse absolution* must we not, besides the above reason, have all the other conditions which are set forth in the concluding words of the Instruction?

IV. Can a confessor oblige a parent *sub poena denegandae absolutionis* in every case to seek the judgment of the Ordinary?

Resp. Neither the Instruction of 1875 nor the Decrees of the Third Plenary Council, which are based on the Instruction, would, by their terms, justify the above-mentioned declaration. It is true the Bishop has the power and also the right to refuse absolution, and, under given conditions, to sanction such refusal in his priests. But the use of a power and right, though clearly defined by the letter, is not justified unless it takes account of the circumstances under which it is to be applied and thus maintains the spirit which prompts its sanction. The law permits us to kill a wanton intruder, but it is only under certain circumstances that we would be justified in making use of this power and right.

Now the power and right of refusing absolution to parents who send their children to neutral, or public schools, is not founded in the terms of the Pontifical Instruction or in those of the Plenary Council; it is founded in the general prin-

ciples of Catholic morality, and would exist in the fullest force of its present meaning even without any Instruction or Council. The latter only bring it to mind and insist on its proper use. This is made quite plain by the Instruction itself when it states "that those who obstinately oppose the appeal to have their children trained in the Catholic religion cannot be absolved is the clear teaching of Catholic theology" (eos si contumaces fuerint absolvi non posse in sacramento poenitentiae *ex doctrina morali catholica manifestum est*). Cf. Instr. cit. et Concl. Plen. III.

Does a priest or approved confessor then require the Bishop's sanction for carrying out the principles of moral theology? Certainly not. But since the S. Congregation recognizes the fact that parents may, under certain circumstances, lawfully send their children to public schools, (*i. e.*, without thereby violating the precept which obliges them to train up their offspring in the Catholic faith), and since this fact is open to arbitrary interpretation, either on the part of parents or of pastors and confessors, the judgment of both, in cases of doubt or contention, is made subject to that of a higher authority, viz, the Bishop's decision. "Ceterum S. Congregatio non ignorat talia interdum rerum esse adjuncta ut parentes Catholici prolem suam scholis publicis committere in conscientia possint. Id autem non poterunt nisi ad sic agendum sufficientem causam habeant; ac talis causa sufficiens in casu aliquo particulari utrum adsit necne, id conscientiae ac judicio Ordinariorum relinquendum erit." (Instr. cit.)

In general, therefore, a pastor or confessor, acting on the principle of moral theology which safeguards the faith of the child, allows a parent to send his offspring to the public school or he forbids it. If the parent refuses to accept the judgment as fair, it becomes a question of a *casus particularis utrum adsit causa sufficiens necne*, and the Bishop decides as his conscience directs.

It is plain, therefore, that a general declaration of not absolving unless the Bishop's permission (expressed and particular) be obtained in every case, is placing the burden

of consulting the Bishop upon persons who have a right to ask it at the hand of the pastor, if he is able to judge; and ordinarily his knowledge of theology and of the circumstances attending the case should enable him to form a judgment whether he can conscientiously allow attendance in a public school without jeopardizing the faith of the child. The phrase *causa sufficiens in casu aliquo particulari utrum adsit necne* is not the same as if it read *in omni casu* or *in singulis casibus.*

Hence, a priest is hardly warranted in making the above mentioned announcement. This answers, we believe, all the proposed questions simultaneously.

We may recall here the answer of the Propaganda which was recently (4 Feb., 1895) given to a query by an American Bishop, namely, whether the Ordinary has the faculty of refusing absolution to parents (parentes, mala voluntate ductos) sending their children to public schools. It referred to the dispositions of the Council of Baltimore as regards the obligation of parents to have their children educated in the Catholic faith, and the duty of the Bishop to watch over that education. The letter ended in these significant words: "attamen quoad *modum* obligandi catholicos genitores, ut filios mittant ad scholas parochiales, id relinquitur prudenti judicio Ordinariorum, qui attentis specialibus adjunctis temporum, locorum et personarum in quibus versantur, id pro sua sapientia decernunt quod magis expediens et efficax existimant pro attingendo exoptato fine." (See AM. ECCL. REVIEW, April, 1895.) It says nothing of refusing absolution but reiterates the fundamental principles of moral theology and pastoral prudence.

TWO SERVERS IN LOW MASS.

Qu. Your answer to J. P's query in the last number of the REVIEW suggests the following:

If it may be legitimate in certain low Masses (on account of the solemnity of the day) to use more than two lights, is it equally

legitimate, for the same reason, to employ two Servers in place of one (as prescribed by the rubrics of low Mass). Ex. gr. Can I have two Servers regularly on Sundays at the principal Mass?

Could the same privilege be presumed on account of the dignity of the celebrant, such as Monsignore, visiting Canons, Vicars General?

Resp. The privilege of employing two Servers at a low Mass holds good under the same conditions which allow the use of more than two lights, *i. e.*, *propter solemnitatem diei festi.* Personal dignities and titles, unless of Bishops and Cardinals, carry with them no such privilege. In the *Decreta authentica* of Muehlbauer Supplem., vol I, pg. 413, there is a lengthy note discussing the question. From it we cite the following passage, which contains the gist of the answer to the present query: "Qua in re adeo sibi esse insistendum censuit S. Congregatio, ut ipsos etiam praelatos Episcopo inferiores, in missis privatis, quoad indumenta, caeremonias, ministros, altaris ornatum a simplicibus sacerdotibus non differre ac proinde eos unico ministro contentos esse debere ac duas tantum candelas lucere in altari iterum sancivit."—(*Corresp. de Rome 1858. Series III, pag. 334, etc.*)

THE EXTENT OF THE DECREE DE APERITIONE CONSCIENTIAE.

Qu. Does the Decree *De Aperitione Conscientiae*, quoted in your March number, pag. 269, include the Orders and Communities that are composed for the most part of priests, and have spiritual communication as a rule of their Order?

Resp. The Decree referred to, which was published in the REVIEW and commented upon by P. Sabetti, S. J. (vol. VI, March, 1892, pag. 161 and 232), is addressed to superiors of religious communities of women, and of laymen, whose constitutions prescribe or sanction the rule that so-called manifestation of conscience may be required by the local or general superiors of the Order or Congregation. The terms of the document are quite explicit on this point:

"*Institutorum mulierum* sive votorum simplicium sive solemnium, *nec non virorum omnimode laicorum* . . . praefatae dispositiones omnino deleantur penitusque expungantur. Irritat pariter ac delet quoslibet ea de re usus et consuetudines etiam immemorabiles. —Districte insuper prohibet memoratis superioribus ac superiorissis, cujuscumque gradus ac praeeminentiae sint, ne personas sibi subditas inducere pertentent directe aut indirecte, praecepto, consilio, timore, minis, aut blanditiis ad hujusmodi manifestationem sibi peragendam; subditisque converso praecipit, ut superioribus majoribus denuncient superiores minores, qui eos ad id inducere audeant," etc.

(Ex Decr. S. Congr. Ep. et Reg. die 17 Dec., 1890.)

Nevertheless there remained some doubt and the S. Congregation was asked to define the precise terms of the decree, stating whether it embraced members of Congregations of priests such as the Salesians founded by Dom Bosco, or the Priests of the Mission founded by St. Vincent de Paul, etc. The answer given by the S. Congregation to this question was: *Negative.* (Rescript. S. C. Ep. et Reg. 15 April, 1891. Vd. AM. ECCL. REVIEW l. c. pag. 235 for the full text of the decision.)

SEMINARIST OR SEMINARIAN?

Qu. The Latin word *seminarista* is the name for a young studen in our seminaries. Leave off the termination, and the stem gives u the English word *seminarist.* I have heard that this is the word common use in England, but how is it that we use the big wor *seminarian?* It is true that some of our priests use the word semi narist, but the majority use seminarian. In our councils and synods we use the words *seminarii alumnus, ecclesiasticus alumnus* and *seminarista,* but I have never seen the word *seminarianus;* if it is a Latin word it is not in my vocabulary. But supposing that the word seminarian is good English and we have two words to choose from, the latter is certainly the one to be preferred; it is shorter and more musical.

The word "parish" is a noun and an adjective. Using it as an adjective, we talk of parish works, parish schools, parish societies,

etc. Since we have this good short adjective of two syllables, why should we waste time and ink and paper in talking of and writing of parochial works, parochial schools, parochial societies, etc. ?

Resp. The exclusive use of *seminarist*, on the plea that *seminarian* lacks a proper etymological source (since the Latin has no such word as *seminarianus*), can hardly be sustained. Following the recognized system of tracing the meaning of derivatives we find that the two forms owe their existence to two different conceptions, and are properly used in English with the same distinction as the two Latin words *seminarista* and *seminarii alumnus*, that is to say, one denotes the *exercise* of a certain calling, namely, the training in the ecclesiastical life, and the other the locality (family or place) to which the ecclesiastic belongs. It is true we have no Latin word *seminarianus*, but neither have we *seminarista* in classical Latin. The ecclesiastical writers who coined the latter term also found that the good Latin *seminarii alumnus* perfectly expressed the thought *in seminario alitus*, *i. e.*, brought up in, or coming from the seminary, and therefore they had no need of coining a word like *seminarianus*; but when they wished to speak of the ecclesiastic as in active training they used the ending *ista* as most expressive of that characteristic.

When the words passed into English the distinction was apparently accepted and a similar process of adaptation took place. We had *seminarist* from *seminarista*, and as we had no single term for *seminarii alumnus*, we coined "*seminarian*" in perfect accord with the formation of derivatives in Latin words, *ian* being added to the roots of adjectives and nouns to indicate origin of family or place.

Hence the preference in the use of the two words depends not wholly on the fact that one is shorter and more musical; at least, not with those who think that the choice of one may at times express their meaning more accurately.

As to the use of "parish" and "parochial" there are equally good reasons for preference on one side or the other. We should like to see both employed, if it were for no other

reason than to remind us that there is a difference between Roman canons governing Catholic administration, and English law regulating the "Establishment." It is only the slight difference between "parson" and "pastor" or "father"

THE USE OF ENGLISH PRAYERS AND HYMNS DURING EXPOSITION OF THE BL. SACRAMENT.

Qu. Is the *public* recitation of prayers (and litanies) in honor of the Sacred Heart, and the Congregational singing of hymns in English, during Forty Hours Exposition, contrary to the rubrics? There is a current impression among priests that the public Exposition of the Forty Hours is an exclusively liturgical function during which only Latin prayers and hymns are permitted, except such as are recited privately by the people?

Resp. The *liturgical* prayers are those which are prescribed in the ritual books of the Church as an essential part of the various liturgical functions. Such are the *Tantum Ergo*, the *Litaniae Sanctorum*, the *Te Deum*, the *Orationes* of the permanent and universal ritual. Others are devotional and they may be recited aloud or chanted without interference of the prescribed ceremonial. These prayers, litanies and chants must, however, have the approbation of the S. Congregation or of the Bishop. The following decisions explain the answer:

S. C. Rit. 27 Feb., 1882.—1. Utrum liceat sacerdoti celebranti ante vel post expletum Missae sacrificium *publice* recitare preces vel hymnos in lingua vernacula, v. g. preces novendiales B. M. V. vel alicujus Sancti *coram SS. Sacramento publice exposito?* Resp. *Affirmative.*

2. Utrum liceat sacerdoti devotionem sacratissimi Cordis Jesu in Ecclesia publice celebranti, *coram SS. Sacramento solemniter exposito recitare actus vel alias preces* in honorem ejusdem sacratissimi Cordis *in lingua vernacula* ad auditum populi fidelis adstantis, ita ut ad istas preces vel actus respondere valeat? Resp. *Affirmative.*

3. Utrum liceat generaliter ut chorus musicorum id est cantorum, *coram SS. Sacramento* solemniter exposito decantent hymnos *in lingua vernacula?* Resp. *Posse*, dummodo non agatur de hymno *Te Deum* et aliis quibuscumque liturgicis precibus quae nonnisi latina lingua decantari debent.

The mention of the *Te Deum* does not imply that it is forbidden to sing it in the vernacular after the Mass or Exposition before the close of the service.

As regards Litanies, the S. Congregation explains a previous restriction which throws light on other decrees of the same kind, in the following decision of October 29, 1882.

Monitum S. hujus Congregationis (sub die 16 Junii, 1880 latum) respicere Litanias in liturgicis et publicis functionibus recitandas; posse vero, imo teneri Ordinarios alias seu novas litanias examinare, et quatenus expedire putent, approbare; at nonnisi pro privata atque extraliturgica recitatione.

REMOVAL OF THE BL. SACRAMENT FROM ONE ALTAR TO ANOTHER.

Qu. Please state the rubric or your opinion concerning the manner in which the Blessed Sacrament should be carried from one altar to another, when this is done daily, there being only a boy to assist the priest? I think it very inconvenient to do, as prescribed by Wapelhorst, page 187, and Schneider, page 552, for Holy Thursday. I put on the humeral veil before going to the altar, and having taken the Ciborium out of the one Tabernacle, put it into the other without placing it on the altar. Should I always do as prescribed by the above authorities for Holy Thursday?

CHRISTOPHORUS.

Resp. There is no special ceremonial prescribed for the casual removal of the Bl. Sacrament from one altar to another. The rite of Holy Thursday is part of the solemn function and not necessarily a norm for the case in question. Hence any decorous method of transferring the Ciborium from one Tabernacle to the other would be lawful. The humeral veil and a server preceding with lighted candle should never, where possible, be dispensed with.

THE EMPLOYER'S DUTY AND THE LABORER'S RIGHT TO OCCULT COMPENSATION.

Qu. Would you kindly give your solution of the following case: Titius operarium, quem ex sola caritate, nulla mercede petita vel promissa, conduxerit, post aliquot annos surripientem detegit summam pecuniae quam sibi debitam esse in justum servitii salarium operarius allegat. Attamen Titius miserum coram judice compellat, et judex eum in sex menses captivitatis damnat.

Quaeritur: An aeque justeque operarium tractaverit? et quatenus negative, ad quid teneatur?

Resp. Theological precept and common sense agree that a laborer employed out of charity (which means of course that his labor yields him at least the necessary sustenance) is not allowed to compensate himself for what he considers the value of his labor, by stealing from his master. It would lead to innumerable errors of conscience practically sanctioning theft to any extent. (See any theological work on "De occulta compensatione.")

We assume that this is supposed by the confessor, who in the present case is asked, not to judge of the morality of the laborer's act, but to decide upon the morality of the employer's action who retains a man, hired because he asked for work without making any stipulation regarding wages, for several years, and then finding that the laborer had quietly compensated himself from the master's property by what he considered his just earnings, has the man arrested and imprisoned for six months.

To judge rightly regarding the equity and justice of the employer's action, and regarding his duty of repairing any injury done to the rights of earning and perchance the good name of the imprisoned laborer, demands some details of the case, which the writer of the above question does not give.

What was the actual value of the laborer's work to his master? It might have been slight or nothing by reason of the workman's strength, disposition, health, mental ability, age; or by reason of the fact that there was no need of anything being done though the laborer managed to keep himself busy?

Did the employer use any force, even moral, to retain the workman in his service?

Did the laborer at any time make a just demand for his services and receive a promise of adequate compensation?

Was the laborer's position such as to call by its very nature for additional compensation according to the common view of conscientious men?

These and kindred points would reveal the true circumstances on which the justice of the laborer's demands must depend; and though he was obliged to seek compensation by open and honest means, they would show how far the master took undue advantage of the laborer's situation and violated just rights. The measure of this violation is the measure of what he now owes to the prisoner in addition to a certain redress for the penalty inflicted.

But in estimating this duty it must be remembered that the right of occult compensation demands that the debt which Titius owes the laborer is a claim of strict justice, not merely conventional or such as gratitude would call for; that it is certain; that the claim could not readily be made good in any other way; and that no injury is done to any third party, who is apt to be suspected or to suffer material injury from the act.

With these data ascertained, which would in all likelihood bring out other circumstances, a judgment as to the equity and justice of Titius' action could be formed, so far as it belongs to the guide of conscience to determine the matter.

THE CHILDREN'S MASS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

Qu. Is it better to have children attend Mass with their parents than to be present at the Children's Mass in the Sunday School?

Resp. Local conditions would have a most important bearing on this question. In general it is an advantage to have the children apart from grown folks so as to receive the training which they need under the personal care of a vigilant Rev-

erend Director. He should make himself always visible and at times audible at the Mass for the children. He will find some scholars that need a personal admonition concerning behavior in the church. Other rules of order may be announced in general terms. Under this sort of management the children's Mass has an educational value, and will prove most attractive to the children themselves.

By request of the Editor of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW the Rev. Thomas McMillan, C. S. P., has furnished the following description by an acute observer of how the Mass for the children is conducted at St. Paul's Sunday School, New York city.

A writer of wide experience in relation to work for children made this statement:

I can say that never had I assisted at Mass with such fixed attention and recollection as the morning on which I first heard that service for the children in the Paulist Sunday School.

The entire congregation of the children not only assist, but the assistance is made more intensely practical by the concerted and modulated prayers recited aloud. When the priest and his attendants enter the sanctuary their approach is heralded by the tinkle of a bell. In a moment the hum from over a thousand voices is hushed. At the foot of the altar the priest begins in Latin, while the pupils and teachers make the sign of the cross, and begin to recite in clear, audible tones the opening prayer. Immediately after the prayer is ended, the Reverend Director, standing outside the altar-rail, announces the first hymn, which is sung to music of devotional spirit.

Then the Gospel of the day is read in English to the children, at the same time the priest is reading it in Latin. After the Gospel the whole body of children recite the Apostles' Creed. No one could join in the beautiful prayer at the Offertory without understanding better the teaching of the Church in regard to the Mass. At the conclusion of the prayer the second hymn was sung with exquisite feeling by voices that evinced careful training. During the time of Consecration all were bowed down in silent adoration. In subdued tones the prayers begin again. The Our Father was said simultaneously with the priest, and the pathetic petitions to the Lamb of God for mercy were answered with fervent devotion. Then

came a hymn to the Blessed Sacrament, which lasted till the priest finished giving Communion.

Just after the Communion the announcements from the notice book on various parish topics were made by the Reverend Director, and the concluding hymn was sung. As soon as the priest turned to leave the altar the children recited a prayer of thanksgiving. Then the teachers began without delay the instruction of the classes in Christian Doctrine.

M. J. LAVELLE.

AUTHORITY OF PLENARY AND PROVINCIAL COUNCILS.

Some months ago the most Rev. Archbishop of St. Louis submitted to the Sacred Congregation of the H. Office the following *dubia:*

1. Utrum Episcopi in concilio sive plenario sive provinciali legitime coadunati vera potestate legislativa potiri censeantur?
2. Utrum decreta Conciliorum sive plenariorum sive provincialium a S. Sede in forma communi confirmata vel adprobata vel saltem recognita omnimoda vi legum careant, nisi, in statuta dioecesana jam fuerint incorporata, et quidem tantum valeant in quantum sic fuerunt incorporata?

On the 30th of September the Cardinal Secretary sent the following answers of the Sacred Office to His Grace of St. Louis with the request that they be made public:

Ad 1. *Affirmative.*

Ad 2. *Negative.*

THE APPOINTMENT OF PERMANENT RECTORS AND CONSULTORS IN THE ST. LOUIS DIOCESAN SYNOD.

To the Editor AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

As the report in the "Church Progress" regarding the proceedings of the St. Louis Diocesan Synod has caused some misapprehension of Archbishop Kain's action in the appointment of Permanent Rectors and Consultors, permit me as the Secretary of the Synod to explain the facts.

The Archbishop had determined to create fifteen Irremovable Rectorships, and to appoint six Consultors, thus establishing an electoral College with twenty-one votes. He was fully aware that the laws of our Third Plenary Council of Baltimore do not declare an Irremovable Rector ineligible to the office of Consultor; nor did he question the compatibility of the two offices, when combined in one person, but, for good reasons, he preferred to keep them apart. Among those who were to be proclaimed as Irremovable Rectors, were Mgr. Walsh and Fr. Goller. On opening the ballots it was found that the clergy had given them the highest number of votes for Consultors. This fact, of course, would not interfere with the Archbishop's intentions respecting the two offices, since the law leaves him absolutely free in the selection of Consultors *post propositionem cleri;* yet, from a sense of courtesy, he explained his views to these two Rectors. They at once acknowledged the propriety and expediency of his contemplated action and declared themselves in full accord with him.

There was not the least misconception of the law on this matter, and the Archbishop's way of carrying it out—filling twenty-one offices with twenty-one men, thus establishing twenty-one electoral votes, meets with the approval of his entire clergy.

Now it would be of some practical value to determine whether a priest, who is both an Irremovable Rector and a Consultor, may cast two votes in the electoral College, or only one. If he has two votes he wields greater power than this law probably intended to give to one man; if but one, an important office, created by that law, becomes absolutely ineffectual in the very important matter of the ballot. It appears indeed safe to hold that such an incumbent might claim and exercise the right of casting two ballots. The interests of the diocesan clergy which the law endeavors to promote are more satisfactorily guarded where the electoral College is as large as the law permits, and where the electors have each but a single vote to cast.

In this light Archbishop Kain's practice seems to meet the spirit of the law very adequately, and will, as a rule, give more satisfaction than any other.—What is the opinion of the Editor.

St. Louis, Mo. JOHN H. MAY.

We should be quite in accord with the view expressed, if it could be established that the aim of securing a large

electoral voting capacity is of greater importance to the Diocese than that of securing Consultors who represent the spirit and voice of the Clergy. The office of Consultors is supposed to carry with it very weighty responsibilities and proportionate influence, since they are, to use the words of the Council, the "coadjutores ac consiliarii qui Episcopis in gubernandis suis dioecesibus consilio et opera adsint." They are supposed, therefore, to be selected from the clergy of first rank in point of piety, zeal, learning, practical experience and ecclesiastical observance ("pietate morumque integritate, sollicitudine pro animarum salute, doctrina, prudentia, rerum hominumque experientia, necnon sacrorum canonum et dioecesanorum statutorum observantia insignes" *conc. cit.* n. 17 and 18). The names proposed by the Clergy for such an office must, we suppose, largely indicate the possession of these qualities in a priest who might nevertheless, according to the above rule, be debarred from exercising his legitimate influence in the good government of the diocese for the sole reason that he might be enabled to exercise that influence in the election of a future bishop.

There is probably much to be said on both sides of a question which takes its merits partly from local and particular circumstances. We do not, however, think that the policy suggested by our Reverend Correspondent would operate as beneficially everywhere as it may do in St. Louis.

As to the question whether priests holding the two offices should have two votes or one in the electoral College, we believe that one vote would most justly realize the intent of the law, since it is meant to elicit the judgment of the electors rather than to ascertain what number of electors favor a certain candidate.

BOOK REVIEW.

POPE LEO XIII. By Justin McCarthy, with a frontispiece. (Public Men of To-day. An International Series.)—New York: Frederick Warne & Co. 12 mo., Pp. 260. Pr. $1.25.

Mr. Justin McCarthy, true to the principle stated by him at the end of his "History of our own Times" writes neither preface nor epilogue to this latest sketch from his pen. His attitude has to be judged from the contents of the book, and that attitude strikes us as eminently satisfactory from whatever point of view we may regard it. The historical survey of the condition of the papacy on the eve of Leo's election is not only complete, but with judicial impartiality set forth. Mr. McCarthy is a Catholic and a Home-ruler, yet, none of the statements by which he vindicates the claims of either allegiance to fair consideration from men of different bias, can be said to be the expressions of mere sentiment. He reasons wherever facts by themselves are insufficient to call for conviction. One of the best chapters of the book, illustrating this statement, is the first, entitled "The Dead Pope," in which the author incidentally explains the Catholic belief regarding the Infallibility of the Pope, in a way which must appeal to the fair-minded non-Catholic reader for whom this Life of Leo XIII in "The Public Men of To-day" series is principally designed, since Catholics have already quite an exhaustive store of biographical history on the same subject. The statement on page 23 "if the Pope should find it impossible," etc., is somewhat misleading. In his view of Leo's sympathies with the Irish struggle for just government Mr. McCarthy takes the high stand of impartial criticism. Speaking of the episode of Mr. Errington's supposed mission to the Vatican under the late Lord Granville, the writer sums up the situation as follows :

"In Ireland the national feeling still remained for a time unsatisfied and excited. There was a good deal of anger among the Nationalists because of the manner in which Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville were supposed to have acted. It was firmly believed by

many persons, for a time, that the English Government had insidiously endeavored to bring influence to bear upon the Vatican, in order that the Pope might be prevailed upon to censure the Nationalist movement in Ireland. Assuredly nothing could have been more unwise on the part of any English Government than to make such an attempt, but Pope Leo was the last man in the world likely to allow himself to be drawn into such a piece of diplomatic artifice. Let it be added that Mr. Gladstone was the last man in the world likely to make such an attempt. I am satisfied that on the side of the Vatican, and on the side of the English Government, there was absolute good faith and high purpose. The one mistake made by the Government was in paying any attention whatever to Mr. Errington, or in allowing him or anybody else to suppose for a moment that he had been entrusted with any diplomatic mission."

Mr. McCarthy's estimate of Pope Leo's influence in American affairs is equally fair, despite the fact that he could hardly have had an objective appreciation of the undercurrent, which must have affected the policy of the Holy See in its disposition of the various controversies that have agitated the Catholic body during the last ten years.

The picture which he draws of the Pontiff is altogether that of a grand and imposing ruler, a reformer, enterprising and prudent; one who could take in new ideas, and with whom "the mere antiquity of an evil or an abuse had no spell to repress his reforming energy."

Those who are already familiar with Mr. McCarthy's works will be readily attracted to the reading of this new volume from his pen, by the clear, terse and thoughtful style of his writing.

We call attention to an error in the date of the Conclave which elected Leo XIII. For "April" (pag. 17) read "February."—There were actually present sixty-two (not sixty-one) Cardinals.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ad usum Seminariorum hujus regionis accomodatum ab Aloysio Sabetti, S.J. Editio duodecima novis curis expolitior.—Fr. Pustet & Co.—Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati, 1896.

The fact that the Compendium of the Gury-Ballerini Moral Theology, especially prepared for American students by our indefatigable Father Sabetti, has reached its twelfth edition is in itself a

sufficient proof, both of the worth of the book and of the fact that it is retaining its hold upon the favor of the American clergy.

The present edition has been newly revised, references have been added and corrected, whilst here and there a name, such as Sarra, or of works not generally accessible or decisively authoritative, has been omitted. Among the revisions of the text we note particularly the change in the question "utrum iis qui ad jejunium non tenentur et quibus licet vi indulti vesci carnibus, liceat his vesci pluries in die?" The answer explains more at length and clearly that people who are freed, *for whatever reason*, from the obligation of fasting are also free to eat meat several times a day *even where the episcopal indult does not make special mention of this concession.* (334 ad 8.)

Attention is also devoted to the concession for workingmen in regard to the law of abstinence. The author notes that the term *operarii* is to be understood in its ordinary sense as applied to what are commonly known as the laboring classes.

In the *Index Alphabeticus Generalis* at the end, which is a great convenience for obtaining references, we notice two slight errors—pag. 853 under *altare* read *1060 Qu. 4* for *ibid* (*i. e., 1059*) *Qu. 4.* On pag. 896 under *vinum* read *678* for *673.*

THE CHRISTIAN INHERITANCE, Set forth in Sermons. By the Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S B., Bishop of Newport.—London: Burns & Oates. (New York: Benziger Bros.) 12mo. Pp. 430. Pr. $1.60.

They are charming things,—clear and strong thoughts set in the chaste language of divine truth and English sound—which flow from the pen of Bishop Hedley. His "Retreat," published two years ago, has impressed us better than any other work of its kind, and these sermons are in the same vein. They are not to be preached to any congregation, they are for the thoughtful, for those who can enter into moods of earnest reflection. They explain mysteries of faith and divine charity, simply enough, but not in tones familiar to those who need the loud voice to be attracted. Hence, they are for, in the first place, the priest, to read, to digest, and to feed his soul, mind and heart, with the rich light and warmth of truth. So filled, his task of feeding the sheep and the lambs becomes easy. He knows how to call them by their names, and, drawing forth from the storehouse of his own memory and sympathy "old

things and new " as may be needed, he will draw to himself his own, like the Good Shepherd who committed to him the care of His flock. The topics which Bishop Hedley here treats are sufficiently varied to be serviceable for all occasions in which a priest may find himself called on to speak to earnest intelligence. Revelation, Mystery, The Science of God, The Way to Believe, The Word of God, The Obedience of Faith, The Religion of Jesus Christ, The Church the Conquest of the Sacred Heart, Brotherly Love, The Pastoral Office, The Virgin Mother, Liberty, The Convent Church, Bl. John Gabriel Perboyre—such are some of the titles found in the contents of this volume. May we have much more from the same source, for the author is one who binds the memory of the present to that of Ullathorne and Manning and Newman.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICAE IN USUM SCHOLARUM, Auctore G. Bernardo Tepe, S. J. Vol. IV. Tract. de Sacramentis in Genere et in Specie, de Novissimis. Parisiis, Lethielleux (Rue Cassette, 10). Pp. 822. Pr. 6 francs.

Index Alphabeticus Generalis. Pp. 19.

With the present fourth volume these Institutes of dogmatic theology are brought to a close. The index issued separately unlocks the entire work. There would still remain for treatment the subjects of human acts, sin, law and the virtues, but to these the author purposes devoting a special supplemental volume.

Never before in the history of the Church has there been such urgent need that her ministers be thoroughly informed with the science of dogma as to-day. Outside of her pale religion is either utterly eclipsed or is fading away into the dimmest light and feeblest warmth of emotionalism, whilst within there is more than ever the demand that the children of the household be grounded in the foundation of their belief, not only that they may be able to give to others reasons for the hope that is in them, but that they may hold more than a sentimental grasp on the supernatural truths and life so sorely beset by the all-pervading naturalism. It is, of course, in the Seminary that the formation of the theological *habit* must be begun and carried far forward, so far at least as to leave the ripening process rather than the substantial growing for the busy days of the active ministry. Hence, the pressing need for a solid course of dogma in the Seminary. Nor will it suffice for this end to have

simply an efficient professor. There must be the thorough, timely text-book to which the student will always afterwards recur rather than to manuscript notes for the refurbishing or completing of his theological knowledge. It is not long since the selection of such a book was no easy task, and some of our Seminaries contented themselves with little compendia and inadequately digested compilations. What difficulty there now is in making a selection comes more from the abundance than from the scantiness of supply. With such courses at hand as the recently revised editions of Vincent, the handsomely printed course by Fr. Tanquery and the present excellent work of Fr. Tepe the choice ought to be comparatively easy. The difficulty seems to be mainly the cutting loose from traditional prejudice against innovation—prejudice often as unwise in its object as it is fruitful in pernicious consequences. To the question often asked, "Which is the best text-book for a class of dogmatic theology," the answer must be, "There is no best." Each, especially of those recently produced, has its own merits to commend it. But truly *amongst* the best are these Institutes by Fr. Tepe. We have spoken in praise of the three preceding volumes as they separately appeared, and we wish to reiterate that praise of this, the concluding volume. The author here, as before, makes that just discrimination between the primary and the secondary theological doctrines, establishing the one class solidly in his central theses and relegating the other to the numerous appended scholia which shows at once the master mind that grasps its subject in its entirety and discerns unerringly the relative value of its parts and detail.

The whole matter, moreover, is elaborated with such perspicuity of method, neat precision and lucidity of statement and felicity of illustration that one is hardly conscious of being in the depths of an abstract science. Fortunate is the ecclesiastic of to-day that he is blessed with so excellent an aid to the acquisition of theology.

F. P. S.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By William Stang, DD., Vice-Rector of the American College, Louvain, etc.—Brussels: Société Belge de Librairie. (N. Y., Benziger Bros.), 1897.

It is with genuine pleasure and a feeling of gratitude which will, we are sure, be shared by all American priests and students of theology who love their calling, that we announce this volume on

Pastoral Theology. Hitherto we have had no work of the kind in the English language, except translations from the German or French, more or less faithful and more or less uninviting, by their lack of attention to the circumstances of distinctly American missionary life. How very much these circumstances differ from those which the traditional methods of pastoral teaching are apt to consider can be realized only by men who have not only lived the pastoral life in America, but whose ministry has brought them into contact with the various elements that compose the Catholic population in great American centres. Neither the man of study in the rural parish, whose opportunities for observation are limited, nor the professor of the theology, who has not learned to sympathize with the needs of the scattered thousands constituting the laboring element of large manufacturing districts, could attempt the work of teaching pastoral theology in America without being either one-sided or deficient. The man who would instruct the young cleric in this science must combine the qualities of both ; he must be a man of books and a man of practical experience, whilst to it all he must add a keen appreciation of the popular non-Catholic mind, and a generous attitude toward the members of the clerical body, whose duties and functions cannot always be measured by one and the same standard of the ascetical and practical life.

Dr. Stang, in undertaking the work, finds himself equipped with all these requirements. His years of varied missionary work in the Cathedral Parish of Providence, R. I., during which the habits of the student retained their hold on him sufficiently to turn his needful recreation to the advantage of literary authorship, have given him the practical knowledge without which his scientific training alone would have been powerless successfully to teach the American seminarist.

The confidence with which we accordingly take up the work is, by no means, lessened when we find that, whilst the ground covered by the author is as complete as a thorough study of the theme demands, the distance of the path that leads us through it is delightfully short. Dr. Stang tells us in the preface that "it was no easy task to compress so much matter into the form of a manual ; hence, so many laconic sentences and aphorisms." He expects, as is just, that the living voice of the professor, for whose students the manual is merely a text, give the necessary expansion and coloring to the different phases and aspects of the pastoral life as here outlined. Besides, it is a distinct advantage to have some latitude allowed in

the directions given, so that they may be adapted to the several and varying circumstances of pastoral activity in the cosmopolitan life of the American Catholic Church.

Dr. Stang divides his matter in three books—Preaching and Catechizing—Administration of the Sacraments (Sacramentals)—and Pastoral Direction. The latter book contains the following topics which in their very grouping suggest something of the author's practical method throughout: The divine fire; a pattern of the flock; the rectory; the friend of the poor; missions; nuns; Catholic schools; building; societies; book-keeping; the priest's library.

Elsewhere we comment in detail on some of the phases of this work, which, apart from its contents, commends itself as an excellent manual for the student by its form and typography and reasonble price.

OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF OUR LORD. By the Rev. Francis E. Gigot, SS. Part I. To the Beginning of Our Lord's Public Ministry.—St. John's Boston Ecclesiastical Seminary; Brighton, Mass. 1896. Pp. 90.

It is a most encouraging feature of Catholic literary activity that it continues to occupy itself more and more with Biblical themes, and particularly by efforts to render popular the results of critical study. Protestants, as might be expected, have been in advance of us in such work. Their faith makes them depend on the Bible and its letter almost exclusively; hence it behooves them to give it all their attention. But whilst the result of critical study of the Bible among Protestants must lead them to recognize eventually the insufficiency of a rule of faith which is subject in many ways to reversal at the dictation of the infidel scholar, Catholics have been enabled to avail themselves of the vast amount of unbiased research in Biblical history, archaeology and language. Father Gigot has not neglected these means. He has studied with careful discrimination such works as Andrews' "Life of Our Lord" (Scribner, 1891), perhaps the most valuable contribution which we possess to the scholarship on the subject. This work, which special students of the New Testament should master, is less critical in parts than Weiss (Life of Christ), particularly where sources are in question which throw light on the exegesis of the New Testament; but it stands far above Farrar's beautiful narrative in point of criticism. Edersheim excels in Rabbinical references, while Stalker, though brief, is as beautiful to read, though less exhaustive than Farrar.

Father Gigot has evidently consulted these and kindred sources of information, not, however, neglecting the excellent works of Catholic writers like Vigouroux, Fouard, Fillion, etc., who deal with the historical aspect of Our Lord's Life and Times. He gives us a simple, accurate and comprehensive survey of the person, earthly habitation and circumstances of our divine Saviour. The book is evidently designed for teachers, who are called on, either in church or school, to explain the gospel to the Christian people or to the young. To the preacher it furnishes the background and circumstance of the incidents and doctrines intended for the instruction of the faithful as drawn from the New Testament. In this respect it is much like Father Maas' valuable "Life of Christ," although much smaller and without direct reference to a parallel text. In short, it is a handy sketch intended to familiarize us with the history of Our Lord on authentic lines. The fact of its being published from St. John's Seminary is another indication of the revival of literary activity among the clergy of this country, which may, we trust, soon awaken the native talent lying apparently dormant in many quarters.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE CHRISTIAN INHERITANCE, Set forth in Sermons. By the Rt. Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport.—London: Burns & Oates (Benziger Bros.) Pp. 430. Pr., bd. $1.60.

EN ROUTE. By J. K. Huysmans. Transl. from the French with Preface by C. Kegan Paul.—London: Kegan Paul, French, Trübner & Co. (Benziger Bros.) Pp. 313. Pr., bd. $1.50.

MISSAE PRO DEFUNCTIS ad commodiorem ecclesiarum usum ex Missali Romano desumptae. Accedit Ritus Absolutionis pro Defunctis. Edid. III post typicam.—Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet., 1896.

SEVEN STORIES. By Lady Georgiana Fullerton. Fourth Edit.—London: Burns & Oates. (Benziger Bros.) Pp. 276. Pr., bd. 70 cents.

THE STRAW CUTTER'S DAUGHTER AND THE PORTRAITS IN MY UNCLE'S DINING ROOM. Transl. from the French by Lady Georgiana Fullerton. London: Burns & Oates. (Benziger Bros.) Pp. 237. Pr., bd. 70 cents.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICAE in usum scholarum. Auctore G. Bernardo Tepe, S.J.—Volumen IV continens tractatus de Sacramentis, de Novissimis. Pp. 823. Additur huic volumini **INDEX ALPHABETICUS GENERALIS** omnium tractatuum et quaestionum quae continentur in quatuor voluminibus totius operis.—Parisiis: P. Lethielleux. Pp. 19. Pr., bd. $1.70.